

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Brown County



305 E. WALNUT STREET
P. O. BOX 23600
GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN 54305-3600
PHONE (920) 448-4015 FAX (920) 448-6221

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Tom Lund, Chair
Tony Theisen, Vice Chair
Kris Schuller, Mark Tumpach, Robert Miller

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Thursday, November 17, 2011

Approx. 6:00 pm (To follow Special CB Mtg)

Room 200, Northern Building
305 E. Walnut Street

- I. Call to Order.
 - II. Approve/Modify Agenda.
 - III. Approve/Modify Minutes of October 19, 2011, October 27, 2011 and November 7, 2011.
1. Review Minutes Of:
 - a. Facility Master Plan Subcommittee (October 20, 2011).

Communications

2. Communication from Supervisor Theisen re: Request to establish a probationary wage for all new county employees. *Referred from November 7, 2011 County Board meeting.*

County Clerk.

3. Resolution Supporting the 2012-2013 Memo of Understanding Between Brown County and the Town of Eaton for the Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS).
4. Resolution Supporting the 2012- 2013 Memo of Understanding Between Brown County and the Town of Holland for the Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS).
5. Resolution Supporting the 2012 – 2013 Memo of Understanding Between Brown County and the Town of Humboldt for the Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS).
6. Resolution Supporting the 2012 – 2013 Memo of Understanding Between Brown County and the Town of Lawrence for the Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS).
7. Resolution Supporting the 2012 – 2013 Memo of Understanding Between Brown County and the Town of Morrison for the Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS).
8. Resolution Supporting the 2012 – 2013 Memo of Understanding Between Brown County and the Town of New Denmark for the Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS).
9. Resolution Supporting the 2012 – 2013 Memo of Understanding Between Brown County and the Town of Pittsfield for the Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS).
10. Resolution Supporting the 2012 – 2013 Memo of Understanding Between Brown County and the Town of Glenmore for the Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS).
11. Resolution Supporting the 2012 – 2013 Memo of Understanding Between Brown County and the Town of Green Bay for the Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS).
12. Resolution Supporting the 2012 – 2013 Memo of Understanding Between Brown County and the Town of Rockland for the Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS).
13. Resolution Supporting the 2012 – 2013 Memo of Understanding Between Brown County and the Town of Wrightstown for the Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS).
14. Resolution Supporting the 2012 – 2013 Memo of Understanding Between Brown County and the Village of Denmark for the Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS).

15. Resolution Supporting the 2012 – 2013 Memo of Understanding Between Brown County and the Village of Pulaski for the Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS).

Corporation Counsel

16. Resolution re: To Authorize Use of Funds to Retain Outside Counsel. *Referred back from November 7, 2011 County Board meeting.*

Human Resources

17. Activity Report for October, 2011.
18. Director's Report.

Department of Administration

19. 2011 Budget Adjustment Log.
20. Director's Report.

Facility & Park Management

21. Budget Adjustment Request (11-50): Increase in expenses with offsetting increase in revenue.
22. Budget Adjustment Request (11-51): Increase in expenses with offsetting increase in revenue.
23. Discussion re: Syble Hopp Pool Cover.
24. Discussion re: Resch Centre Maintenance.
25. Approval of Bid re: Security Fencing at Jail.
26. Director's Report.

Child Support Agency - No agenda items.

Information Services – No agenda items.

Treasurer – No agenda items.

Other

27. Audit of bills.
28. Such other matters as authorized by law.

Tom Lund, Chair

Attachments

Notice is hereby given that action by the Committee may be taken on any of the items which are described or listed in this agenda. Please take notice that it is possible additional members of the Board of Supervisors may attend this meeting, resulting in a majority or quorum of the Board of Supervisors. This may constitute a meeting of the Board of Supervisors for purposes of discussion and information gathering relative to this agenda.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a special meeting of the **Brown County Administration Committee** was held on Wednesday, October 19, 2011 in Room 210 of City Hall –Jefferson Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Tom Lund, Robert Miller, Mark Tumpach, Kris Schuller, Tony Theisen

Also Present: Sheriff Gossage, Bill Dowell

I. Call Meeting to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Tom Lund at 6:45p.m.

II. Approve/Modify Agenda:

Motion made by Supervisor Miller, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to approve. Vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

1. Review and Approval of Bid for Security Fencing at Jail.

Facility Management Director Bill Dowell stated that the Security Fence project at the jail was an ongoing project. They had the intent to fund it a couple years back, the Sheriff was able to come up with some additional funds (\$26,000) this year. Dowell explained that they had originally estimated the project to cost \$25,000-\$26,000. They took it to an architect to get specs and it was determined the project was under-sized and needed to be increased. The estimate from the architect ended up in the \$42,000 range. Dowell explained that they looked into the Facilities budget and found funds available to add and join to the project. They then bid the project and were very pleased that it came under the estimated cost. The low bid came in at \$35,500 from Custom Fence. He informed that they wanted to make sure that Custom Fence understood the project so Facility Project Manager Jeff Oudeans reviewed each of the requirements and verified that they did understand the job. A brief discussion ensued with the costs of the other bids. Dowell reiterated that they always sit down and have a thorough review of the project to make sure people understand the project before they bid. Oudeans reviewed item by item and was very satisfied.

Motion made by Supervisor Miller, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve the low bid of Custom Fence for \$30,500. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. Such other matters as authorized by law.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to adjourn at 7:49 p.m. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia A. Loehlein
Recording Secretary

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular and budget meeting of the **Brown County Administration Committee** was held on Thursday, October 27, 2011 in Room 200, Northern Building, 305 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Tom Lund, Robert Miller, Mark Tumpach, Kris Schuller, Tony Theisen

Also Present: Troy Streckenbach, Amy Kocha, Brian Lamers, Lisa Younk, Paula Kazik, Terri Mac Gregor, Andrea Konrath, Debbie Klarkowski, Maria Lasecki, Bob Heimann, Fred Mohr, Mary Scray, Carole Andrews, Sara Perrizo, Sandy Juno, Darlene Marcelle, John Luetscher, Bernie Erickson, Kerry Blaney, Carolyn Maricque, Dave Kaster, Guy Zima, Bill Dowell, Pat La Violette, Lynn Vanden Langenberg, media, other interested parties.

I. **Call Meeting to Order:**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Tom Lund at 5:30 p.m.

II. **Approve/Modify Agenda:**

Motion made by Supervisor Tumpach, seconded by Supervisor Miller to take Items 8 and 31 – 34 after Item 1. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Miller to suspend the rules to allow interested parties to speak. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

David Nelson, 425 Scott Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin addressed the Committee. He stated that he is the Secretary of the Brown County Taxpayers Association and wished to make three comments:

- He urged the Committee to remember the ability of the taxpayers to carry more property taxes;
- He also urged the Committee not look at the credit card as an alternative to some careful scrutiny of the budget;
- Finally he urged the Committee to refrain from dipping into the reserve fund if at all possible.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to return to regular order of business. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

III. **Approve/Modify Minutes of September 21 & 22, 2011.**

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Theisen to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

1. **Review Minutes Of:**

- a. **Facility Master Plan Subcommittee (September 15, 2011)**

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Miller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

BUDGET REVIEW
REVIEW OF 2012 DEPARTMENT BUDGET

Although shown in proper format here, Item 8 was taken at this time directly followed by Items 31 – 34.

2. County Clerk – Review of 2012 Department Budget.

County Clerk Darlene Marcelle directed the Committee's attention to Pages 28 – 32 of the budget book and also provided the Committee with a report on her budget, a copy of which is attached.

Areas of interest are as follows:

- Proposed 2012 Budget will remain status quo;
- No capital improvements are being requested;
- Table of organization will not change;
- Operating expenses remain status quo;
- Chargebacks will remain similar to past budgets;
- There is no anticipated outlay in 2012 budget;
- Some fees for things such as marriage licenses and chargebacks through statewide voter registration will be increased to meet the levy;
- Intergovernmental charges vary from one election to another; however, this will be absorbed in the budget; municipal and school districts can be charged back for services provided.

Marcelle is asking for a decrease in her revenues because the Village of Hobart is taking on their own alarm issuance which will result in a decrease of revenue of \$3,750.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Miller to decrease revenue by \$3,750 and approve the County Clerk 2012 Budget as amended. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. Child Support – Review of 2012 Department Budget.

a. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2012 Budget Process (Child Support).

Carolyn Maricque directed the Committee's attention to Pages 23-27 of the budget book. Areas she wished to highlight included:

- Intergovernmental revenue is decreased to reflect a reduction in allocation of performance-based funding from the State for 2012;
- Personnel costs have also been decreased, mainly due to the proposed deletion of three child support enforcement specialists which can be removed from the Table of Organization;
- There has been a change in revenue as the CSA will be implementing a charge for Non-IVD cases.

HR Director Debbie Klarkowski stated that there is a recommendation in the resolution to delete a lead child support worker and create a child support supervisor. Klarkowski asked that this change not happen at this time and that the lead support worker remain in the Table of Organization because HR would like to wait until a new Child Support Administrator is hired and let that person evaluate the operation prior to a change being made to the Table of Organization.

Motion made by Supervisor Miller, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to approve the resolution to delete three FTE Lead Child Support Worker Positions and delete one FTE Child Support Clerk; and keep the FTE Lead Child Support Worker position. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

III

Motion by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Theisen to approve the Child Support 2012 Budget as amended. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Although shown in proper format here, Corporation Counsel was taken after Item 34.

4. Corporation Counsel – Review of 2012 Department Budget.

a. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2012 Budget Process (Corporation Counsel).

Corporation Counsel John Luetscher stated that the only major change to his budget would be the resolution before the Committee to approve new or deleted positions as he is proposing deletion of one-half staff attorney position. He stated that in July, 2010 one of the three staff attorneys working in the Child Support Agency asked to go half-time and after conferring with the Child Support Director, this was tried on an experimental basis for over a year and it did work satisfactorily and they made the decision that 2 ½ attorney positions in the Child Support Agency would be adequate. As a result under the proposed 2012 budget, Luetscher had reduced one position from a fulltime position to a half-time position to reflect this.

The other addition to the Corporation Counsel budget is to add one fulltime assistant corporation counsel position. The initiative at the outset was that this would be a more cost effective way to provide legal services and negotiation services to the HR Department. This year approximately \$122,000 will be spent on legal services to the HR Department in addition to collective bargaining services. The position Luetscher is seeking funding for would be \$104,933 plus the cost of a computer, etc. The other benefit according to Luetscher is that an attorney working on a fulltime basis would have additional time that could be dedicated to doing general corporate work for the rest of the County departments. At this time there is too much corporate work for one attorney to handle and the addition of another attorney would be beneficial in Luetscher's opinion. Luetscher provided the Committee with some research he had done on counties around the state, a copy of which is attached. Luetscher felt that by adding a fulltime attorney under this proposal, the County could eliminate outsourcing legal services for the HR Department and use money saved from that to fund the additional attorney.

Supervisor Theisen asked who currently provided legal services to the HR Department and Luetscher answered that currently legal services for HR are handled by Attorney Fred Mohr. Theisen felt that at this time it could not be ascertained how legislative changes will affect HR and therefore it is not known what the legal needs will be and he did not feel a change was necessary at this time. Luetscher answered that there was a perception that the attorneys in the Corp. Counsel office are interchangeable, but this is not true as the attorneys are trained and organized to provide specific services. Luetscher could not find a way to take the half position from Child Support and make it into an additional Corp. Counsel position.

Miller asked Luetscher his opinion on having the head of HR be an attorney and what he felt the pros and cons would be. Luetscher stated that that would be an option and he felt that the pros from the County's perspective would be that you get a department head that can do the collective bargaining and also provide legal advice to the HR Department. The cons from his perspective would be that having an attorney as the head of HR would not help the workload in the Corp. Counsel office.

Board Chair Zima addressed the Committee and stated that he felt this proposal was a ruse. He stated that Attorney Fred Mohr was hired 3 ½ years ago to take on legal work for the HR Department. At that time, the amount of money that spent in HR for outside legal services was reviewed and it was a huge number. Zima stated that the current situation with Attorney Mohr

III

handling legal services in HR is uniquely wonderful in that Mohr provides all services at a flat rate which has not increased since he started. Zima also noted that Mohr is one of the most preeminent attorneys in the State when it comes to labor law and negotiations.

Zima felt it was the intent of County Executive Streckenbach to eliminate the Board attorney in that money was taken out of the budget for the Board attorney position, the HR attorney and the labor negotiator. Zima also pointed out that the labor negotiator who held the position prior to Mohr was paid \$48,000 annually while Mohr is paid \$36,000 annually and further that Mohr would be open to changes in his retainer fee if the work load would decrease due to legislative changes.

Zima did not feel that the County would be able to hire a more cost-effective attorney than Mohr and pointed out that with a staff attorney you would also have to provide staff to assist them, pay fringe benefits and malpractice insurance and also provide equipment and office space. None of this is an issue with Mohr as he works for one flat fee. Zima also felt that most people see extremely high value in Mohr. Zima felt this was one more attempt by administration to strip power from Board. Mohr helps the Board makes the policy decisions that the Board is elected to make. Zima also pointed out that the Board does welcome insight and suggestions and proposals from the administration, however, he felt that anyone who would replace Mohr would be inferior and that the County would not find a better person than Mohr for a better price. Zima recommended the Committee deny the request of Corp. Counsel to fund another attorney and instead continue on with Mohr and restore the funds taken out of the budget for him. Zima also stated that Mohr's position belongs in the Table of Organization as it is an ongoing service and not a short-term or one time service.

Attorney Fred Mohr addressed the Committee and stated that he had been weaned into advising HR. He had been acting Corp. Counsel for a period of time and during that time he began working on some of the labor matters being handled in HR. The County was also using a Madison attorney for labor matters who was charging \$295.00 per hour. In the year prior to Mohr's involvement, the County was charged nearly \$300,000 for legal services and the County was also hiring other outside counsel to do specific types of labor law. When he was hired, Mohr agreed to do the legal work on a retainer basis. Mohr also pointed out that he has been practicing law for 34 years and has done municipal labor law for all of those years.

Mohr went on to say that in the past very large amounts of money had been paid out by Brown County due to mistakes made by previous labor counsel and cited the Shelter Care Facility problems as an example. Mohr asserted that he has not made these types of mistakes and has saved the County money because he knows when we can do things and when we cannot and he felt that was the greatest value he had to the County.

Mohr continued that he did not feel the proposed salary for a new lawyer of \$79,000 would be adequate to hire an experienced labor lawyer. Mohr stated that he works for the County for much less than he would earn working in private practice and the reasons he does is because he likes the people he works with and he likes working with the Board and HR. Another factor is that because of the nature of his retainer, he gets a check each month to cover his expenses and he does not have to worry about the ups and downs of private practice. For these reasons he is willing to work for less than he could make in private practice. He felt the people he works with are very happy with him and have faith in his services. Mohr felt it would be in the County's best interest to continue the current situation as it is right now. He gave an example of a recent case he handled for Brown County with regard to a duty disability workers compensation matter which could have cost the County nearly one million dollars. Mohr negotiated a settlement that was mutually beneficial to all parties involved and he believes he was able to save the County nearly \$700,000 and the reason he

could do this was because of his experience. Mohr stated that he handles not only labor negotiations, but also grievances, terminations and a host of other matters.

Supervisor Tumpach asked Mohr how many hours per week he works for HR and Mohr answered that over the past year he has averaged 78.5 hours per month on HR work.

Mohr also stated that there are 19 unions in four major groups comprised of the Sheriff's Department, Humans Services, AFSCME and Teamsters. Negotiations of these contracts involve negotiating a master contract for each group and then tweaking the smaller unions. Mohr predicated that in the future wages will still need to be negotiated, but negotiation of other benefits will not be necessary and therefore he is willing to reduce his retainer accordingly.

Supervisor Miller asked what contracts Mohr has with the County and what the dollar amount of the contracts are. Zima interjected that currently there are three contracts with Mohr and they are as follows: 1) Board Attorney for \$43,200; 2) Human Resources for \$72,840; and 3) Labor negotiator for \$36,000.

Supervisor Schuller asked the current status of the three contracts. Mohr stated that this presents a legal question and informed the Committee that Corp. Counsel had given him notice approximately five months ago that they were going to terminate his contracts at end of year; however, it is not clear if that office had authority to do so since Mohr was hired by the Board. Mohr stated that notice on the labor negotiation contract was proper that at the end of the year that contract would need to be renegotiated; however, there is a question as to whether the notice given on the other two contracts was proper. Zima stated that this was another example of administration exceeding their authority in that Corp. Counsel, without consulting the Board that had hired Mohr, put him on notice that the situation may change.

Supervisor La Violette stated she did not feel that anyone would question Mohr's credentials; however she is swayed by what Luetscher said that he needs help in his office. She felt the Board needs to listen to Luetscher and seriously consider his request for help, however, she did not feel that this meant we should not contract with Mohr anymore. She'd like to examine both situations. La Violette also asked if there were three separate signed contracts with Mohr. She was also somewhat bothered by the suggestion to add Mohr to the Table or Organization as that could obligate the County to pay him fringe benefits. Mohr answered that there are in fact three separate contracts. Mohr further stated that there are several long-term contracted positions already in the Table of Organization for which they do not pay fringes and gave the example of the nurse practitioner being one of them.

Zima stated that at the September Executive Committee meeting as well as the September Board meeting the Internal Auditor brought up discrepancies in that there were some contracted employees in the Table or Organization as well as some contracted services. The intent of the Board was to put someone who provides a permanent service on an ongoing basis in the Table of Organization.

Zima also addressed La Violette's comment with regard to Corp. Counsel being understaffed and stated that the new initiatives in the 2012 proposed budget add an assistant corporation counsel position to the Table of Organization and that position would be responsible primarily for providing legal services to HR and would handle other Corp. Counsel work as time permits. In response, Luetscher pointed out that in the past there had been two fulltime Corp. Counsel attorneys.

Amy Kocha spoke as lead staff attorney in child support and stated she did not feel the Committee understood what the situation is with the half-time attorney position. The half-time attorney position is no longer in the child support budget and this is not a matter of simply leaving the position intact. Kocha also stated that to suggest that there is not an attorney who would work for the government for \$79,000 plus benefits is absurd. She felt that there are many attorneys who would love to come into public service and would be very good at it. She stated that when child support looked to hire an attorney over the summer, they had 50 applicants for a position that was to pay under \$70,000 and further, some of the applicants were labor law attorneys who no longer had the ability to work in labor law because of changes in government. She also stated that the Committee needs to listen carefully to staff when they ask for help. The proposal to hire a new attorney was brought forward by Luetscher because his department is understaffed. Kocha felt this was a very good proposal and made complete sense for taxpayers and she urged the Committee to support the proposal, keeping in mind the other half-time attorney is coming out of the child support budget.

County Executive Streckenbach stated it was very evident that Corp. Counsel needs help and this is a compromise between HR and Corp. Counsel that he felt was a common sense, practical solution. Streckenbach stated when the budget was originally proposed, it was estimated that contracted services for HR legal advice would be between 5 – 10 hours per week at \$200 per hour. Under this proposal HR would be taken care of for labor advising, labor negotiation and labor arbitration and if we would have to use the WERC for an impartial hearing officer, we would potentially have that individual to that as well, all for about \$105,000 plus the costs of a desk, computer, etc. The other component that would be taken care of under this proposal is to have help that is needed in Corp. Counsel. Currently the County is paying \$108,000 for the same services for approximately 80 hours per month doing only labor advising and labor negotiations.

Streckenbach went on to say that he is in no way disputing the qualification of Mohr and, in fact, he felt he is a fine attorney and has an incredible amount of history with labor law issues. Streckenbach stated that he would not even see anything wrong with Mohr applying for the job as the County would benefit from having someone in a fulltime capacity. Streckenbach also urged the Committee to not lose sight of the fact that Corp. Counsel is inundated with a lot of corporate work and needs help. Streckenbach concluded by urging the Committee to pass this proposal.

Theisen asked Streckenbach if he was aware that Corp. Counsel had sent Mohr notice at the end of June that his contract could be terminated. Streckenbach answered that he was aware of that and further, when his office was looking for the signed contracts with regard to Mohr's services, which they still have not received, the issue of notice was spelled out. In the contract that Streckenbach read, the provision was for six months' notice. Theisen stated that he must assume that Streckenbach and Luetscher did what they felt was the right thing to do, but pointed out that so far he is not convinced that getting rid of Mohr is the right thing to do. All of his experiences to date with Mohr have been positive and he has not heard anything that convinced him that terminating Mohr was reasonable. Streckenbach replied that he was strictly looking at the contract that in the event a decision would be made to terminate Mohr, six month notice was necessary.

Luetscher stated that the notice to Mohr was given at the end of May and the reason it was given at that time was that both labor contracts require six months' notice. Luetscher stated that these notices were given from an entirely budgetary standpoint and were not based on his services. Luetscher went on to say that the last sentence of the letter to Mohr stated that the intent was to give the administration and the Board of Supervisors the necessary flexibility to fashion an agreement that meets the County's needs in 2012. This was never intended to be a "pink slip".

Streckenbach echoed this and stated that the letter to Mohr was simply giving notification that there may be a change and was not in any way a "pink slip".

Supervisor Theisen went on to state that he is willing to look at Luetscher's request for help in his office, however, he felt this was two separate issues. He is not in favor of changing the way legal work is done with HR and he is also willing to look at the need of getting help in the Corp. Counsel office. He is well aware of some of the bad legal decisions that have been made in the County over the years; however, none of these problems have occurred since Mohr has been handling these issues. He is not confident, however, that the County can hire someone for \$79,000 who isn't going to make costly mistakes. He felt that changing legal providers would be a risk and he is not willing to take this risk with the taxpayer's money.

Supervisor Miller stated he did not see anything that would make him to believe that the termination letter sent to Mohr was the result of dissatisfaction with his services. What he gathers is that the people who are in a position to know of Mohr's work uniformly approve of his work and he has not heard one adverse comment. He believes the next question would be if any person with a law degree can deliver the services to the County that are necessary. Miller's opinion is that legal services are not fungible and went on to say that it appears that Mohr is delivering quality legal services and he is hesitant to change and his suggestion is to seriously consider approving Mohr. He also stated that he believed the Statute permits the County to choose someone who is skilled at performing services and not simply the lowest contract. Miller concluded by stating that he does appreciate the County Executive's position in looking at the budget globally; however, his opinion is that eliminating Mohr will cost more in the long run.

Zima again stated the he felt this was a ruse on its face. Mohr was given six months' notice on labor contract which is the smallest of the three contracts. The administration wanted to look at labor negotiations, however, what they did was eliminate the Board attorney and the services to HR even though everyone says those services are fantastic and no mistakes have been made in 3 ½ years. It is proposed that the money that would be saved by eliminating Mohr would be used to hire an attorney because Corp. Counsel needs help in their office. Zima felt that if Corp. Counsel needs help in their office, it should not have anything to do with providing legal services primarily to HR and he suggested that HR conduct a study to see if in fact Corp. Counsel does need another position.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Miller to receive and place on file. Motion withdrawn.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Miller to deny the resolution. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Miller to add \$108,000 to the HR contracted services line - \$72,000 for HR legal advisor and \$36,000 for labor negotiations. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve the Corporation Counsel 2012 Budget as amended. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Dept. of Administration – Review of 2012 Department Budget.

- a. **Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2012 Budget Process (Administration).**

Carolyn Maricque directed the Committee's attention to Pages 18 – 22 of the budget book and reported the following:

- The main change in the revenue for other financing sources has decreased due to the removal of carryover funds from 2011;
- Personnel costs have decreased mainly due to WRS changes;
- A .5 Clerk/Typist which was unfunded last year can now be deleted.

Motion made by Supervisor Miller, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve the resolution to delete the Clerk/Typist I position. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Miller, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve the Department of Administration 2012 Budget as amended. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Facility Management – Review of 2012 Department Budget.

- a. **Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2012 Budget Process (Facility Management).**
- b. **Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2012 Budget Process (Facility Management/Highway Department Merger).**

Facility Management Director Bill Dowell directed the Committee's attention to the Public Works budget contained on Pages 198 – 210 of the Budget Book. He clarified that the Highway Department and Facility Management have been combined into a Public Works Department and he is presenting the Facility portion of the budget. Dowell highlighted the following:

- Both Facilities and Highway will continue to work on the merger into the Public Works Department;
- Facility Management will continue to actively support Brown County's sustainability efforts in 2012 by remaining the Energy Oversight Committee lead; implementing energy projects and actions and updating and refining near-term goals and objectives;
- As a result of a change in county-wide budgeting practices, the department will not need to bond for various facility improvements and building maintenance in 2012 but instead will include these improvements in their general operating budget.
- Revenue reduction from 2011 to 2012 is roughly \$500,000 and this is comprised of one of the energy projects that will be completed;
- There are grants from stimulus money and Focus funds that will no longer appear in the 2012 budget;
- There was a reclassification of the employees in the two unions into one group and this will result in a savings. Personnel costs are also reduced and this is due to reduction of employees as shown in the resolution;
- Outlay is also increasing and some of the bonded projects are being moved into outlay.

Dowell also reported on the Facility Management summary contained on Pages 201 – 202 of the budget book and highlighted the following:

- The recommendation is for 49.4 FTEs and this is a reduction of 4.3 from the 2011 budget;
- With regard to the reorg chart, there is Public Works Director and a Business Manager and these two positions are being funded from the Facility Director and the Highway Director;
- The Document Center is in this organization chart and the reorg committee is looking at the possibility of relocating the DC outside of the Public Works Department.

With regard to the study group, Supervisor Tumpach asked about the position consolidations and if this is where most of the savings came from. Internal Auditor Sara Perrizo stated that two office managers for the Department of Public Works have been added in the budget. Further, the Planning, Development and Transportation Committee approved a resolution to change the office manager position to a Clerk Typist II position for a savings of \$8,607. Dowell suggested this change

rather than eliminate the position altogether and he stated that he would like to revisit this if possible. Perrizo stated that the consensus of the study group was that there was not a need for two office managers in the Department of Public Works.

Dowell responded that the Office Manager I was what was in the original Facilities organization and he asked that rather than eliminate the Office Manager position altogether, it be changed to a Clerk Typist II position. Dowell stated that this office manager position involves a significant amount of work and is a 40 hour per week job. It involves providing support to facility managers, handling all of the purchase orders and invoices, and other office duties including management of vehicles. Dowell believes that at least for the time being they still need the Office Manager I. He also noted that the location for the Public Works Director has not been decided. If this Director will be downtown, Dowell felt there was a strong case for the Officer Manager.

With regard to the resolutions at PD & T, Supervisor Schuller stated his understanding was that the Officer Manager position was adjusted to a Clerk Typist II position to avoid a layoff. Perrizo confirmed this. Supervisor Erickson stated that the first inclination at PD & T was to eliminate the Office Manager position; however, after a discussion it was decided to make the position that of a Clerk Typist II to avoid layoff.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Miller to approve the resolution under 6a. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Tumpach, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to approve resolution under 6b by reducing the Public Works Director salary by \$8,779.00; reducing the Business Manager salary to \$70,448 and deleting the Office Manager I position and adding the Clerk Typist II position at a savings of \$8,607. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Dowell stated that he had looked at the salaries quite thoroughly and stated that it was felt by the study group that the salaries were where they should be to bring in the right talent to fill the positions and it was his opinion is that the salaries should stay as they originally are. Supervisor Schuller stated that salaries were not one of the things they discussed and Sara Perizzo also stated that she did not recall having a discussion regarding salaries. Erickson stated that he did not believe there would be a problem filling the positions at the new salaries.

At this point Chair Lund asked HR Director Klarkowski to explain the changes in HR to keep the maintenance workers at the CTC at the same level. Klarkowski stated that there were 9.5 FTE at CTC and she recommended keeping the title of Housekeeper I but putting their salaries back to the currently salary that they have today at a cost of \$59,901. Lund asked if Klarkowski would recommend doing a study on this for use in hiring people in the future. Klarkowski responded that as the merger continues, they will evaluate positions and then make any necessary adjustments to compensation. Materials provided to the Committee by CTC workers are attached hereto.

Motion made by Supervisor Miller, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to approve continuing with the maintenance staff at the CTC at the same level they are currently at. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve the Facilities Management 2012 Budget as amended. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Supervisor Miller had questions with regard to maintenance of the dome at the courthouse and also the status of the Resch Centre and in particular if sufficient maintenance is being done. A discussion

was held with regard to these issues and it was determined that these issues will be placed on the next Administration Committee agenda for further discussion.

7. Human Resources – Review of 2012 Department Budget.

a. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2012 Budget Process (Human Resources).

Human Resources Director Debbie Klarkowski directed the Committee's attention to Pages 37 – 42 of the budget book and also highlighted the following:

- The personnel costs have decreased due to the elimination of extra help;
- This WRS contributions in the budget have increased;
- One half-time analyst position is being unfunded;
- Operating expenses have decreased due to the elimination of the outside labor attorney contract, however this decrease has been offset by the increase in the general HR budget for administration fees for the County's health benefit reimbursement program (VEBA) and salary reimbursement account that supports Brown County as a whole.

Chair Lund stated that there were questions with regard to the Chapter 4 rewrite and in particular grandfathering employees as well as looking at CTC Center workers and being under a different wage classification than persons doing cleaning around the rest of the facilities. Klarkowski stated that the CTC Center workers falls under Facilities. Lund questioned if CTC workers that have been here over 25 years could be grandfathered so they did not lose any benefits. Klarkowski stated that her understanding was that the Committee would have to make a motion that they wish to grandfather current employees that have more vacation time than what is allotted in Chapter 4. Klarkowski stated that the workers affected by this are the telecom operators, correctional officers, some Sheriff's Department employees and several others throughout the county. The total amount of workers this affects is 81 and there is no financial outlay with this.

Motion made by Supervisor Miller, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to grandfather current employees who have 25 years or more of service for no loss of vacation benefits. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Lund asked Klarkowski if she had concerns with regard to the proposal to unfund a half an analyst position. Klarkowski responded that there are administrative fees in the budget for \$90,000 for the VEBA program that supports all of Brown County and there were also monies in the salary reimbursement account that supports all of Brown County, not just the HR department. Klarkowski stated her preference would be that those line items go into a sub-department but this was not done moving into 2012. If those two cost items were in a separate department, she could recommend funding the analyst position.

Streckenbach stated that at the budget meeting the HR analyst position was not mentioned as being needed. He further stated that discussions had been had with regard to moving the VEBA account and salaries reimbursement account to a different category, but nothing had been solidified. Klarkowski stated that the VEBA was actually not budgeted in 2011; however, in anticipation of going out for the RFP, there were extra dollars (\$50,000) in the HR budget that were set aside for the administrative fees of the VEBA. An additional \$90,000 was put in the budget for 2012 for the administration of the VEBA. Klarkowski stated that she felt this should be a sub-department similar to the health and dental budgets. Klarkowski's concern is that HR unfunded the analyst position to meet the levy given, while \$90,000 was added to the budget for 2012 for administration of VEBA. She also noted that after the budget meeting, \$150,000 was added into the salaries reimbursement account to support the casual day payout for all of Brown County.

County Clerk Darlene Marcelle asked what the VEBA account is as she is not familiar with it. Klarkowski explained that VEBA is an acronym for Voluntary Employee Beneficiary Association and it will be tied to the high deductible insurance plan. It is a method for employees to save future dollars for health care costs.

Lund asked if the HR analyst that is being unfunded is currently a fulltime employee and, if so, if that analyst wished to be cut to a half-time employee. Klarkowski stated that it was a fulltime employee who did not wish to have her hours cut by 20 hours per week.

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2012 Budget Process – Deletion of 1.0 FTE Extra Help. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Klarkowski stated that the projects HR has in 2012 that would necessitate this extra help include implementing KRONOs, an applicant tracking system, continued policy development and implementation of Chapter 4 revisions, countywide position and salary review and review and revisions of current testing procedures.

Supervisor Miller asked Streckenbach what his position was with regard to this and Streckenbach stated that this was not presented to him at the time of the budget meeting and further, up until this point, he was not aware of the justifications listed by Klarkowski for the position. He further stated that if this passed he will revisit it.

Lisa Younk, the HR Analyst affected by this, was in attendance at the meeting and advised the Committee that she did not volunteer to have per position cut. She proposed that this not happen as the County is on the threshold of an unprecedented ability to work with employees without union contracts and she felt that all of the departments will need the support of HR in every capacity available. It was her opinion that without adequate support in HR, employees may not reach a comfort level with the changes going on. She also felt that HR staff is already stretched to capacity and in fact would argue that staff should be increased rather than decreased and she urged the Committee to reconsider their earlier motion so that HR can provide adequate services to the employees of Brown County.

Supervisor Miller felt that Younk made a good argument, but he also felt that the process should be honored in that the County Executive should be given the opportunity to confer with his staff and reach a conclusion as to whether this is necessary before the Committee considers this.

Motion made by Supervisor Miller, seconded by Supervisor Theisen to refer to staff to come up with a recommendation. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve \$36,000 in the 2012 Human Resources Budget for a labor negotiator and \$72,000 for an HR advisor. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Miller to approve the Human Resources 2012 Budget as amended. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Information Services – Review of 2012 Department Budget.

IS Director Robert Heimann provided the Committee with a spreadsheet which outlined a change to the information contained in the budget book, a copy of which is attached.

With regard to his budget contained on Pages 43 – 49 of the budget book, Heimann pointed out the following:

- The disaster recovery plan is an ongoing effort that began a number of years ago and should be complete in 2012;
- Migration from the AS400 to the Blade Center is a significant and multiple year effort which is in the initial stages at this time;
- The 2012 budget has a net reduction from the 2011 budget of \$247,526;
- There is no bonding of any items for IS for 2012;
- The LTE position is still in the budget and will continue for a good portion of 2012.

Heimann explained that the spreadsheet he distributed shows an increase of the budget by \$49,747.00. Subsequent to the time the budget was put together, there have been some staffing changes in his department in that a half-time Programmer/Analyst II will be retiring. The spreadsheet shows elimination of that half-time position from the budget in the amount of \$43,255. The addition on the spreadsheet is to add a Technology Services Manager at a cost of \$93,002. These changes will result in an increase of the IS budget of \$49,747.

Motion made by Supervisor Miller, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to approve the IS 2012 Budget with the addition of a Technology Services Manager for \$93,002 and deletion of a half Programmer/Analyst II position for 43,255. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Treasurer – Review of 2012 Department Budget.

Treasurer Kerry Blaney directed the Committee's attention to Pages 50 – 54 of the budget book and further reported as follows:

- \$50,000 of net revenue was added to the budget for 2012 and this will be comprised mainly of interest on taxes;
- All figures have been diligently reviewed and based on a trend analysis, the net levy budget for 2012 is \$3,216,000.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to approve the Treasurer's 2012 Budget. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Year 2011 Non-Division Budgets Review

10. Debt Service Fund.

Finance Director Carolyn Maricque directed the Committee's attention to Pages 262 - 268 of the budget book and stated there will be a transfer in of approximately \$900,000 from other projects and there will also be another \$300,000 coming in from jail assessments that can be used towards the bonds. There will be principal payments of approximately \$10,800,000 with interest of approximately 6.1% and there will also be some debt issuance and professional fees for the debt. Maricque continued that there will be approximately \$2,000,000 coming back from the enterprises for the debt for the Zoo, Airport and Golf Course. Overall the property taxes for the debt service for 2012 are proposed to be at about \$13,300,000.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to approve the 2012 Debt Service Fund. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

11. Capital Projects.

Finance Director Carolyn Maricque directed the Committee's attention to Page 229 – 261 of the budget book. In referring to the schedule on Page 231, Maricque stated that the first half of the schedule refers to current capital projects in progress that the County has received bonding or other funding for in prior years. The proposed capital projects consist of the capital projects that they are

III

proposing securing bonding for and these include the library renovations, radio interoperability – end user equipment and 2012 highway projects. With regard to the radio operability project Maricque noted that of the \$5,500,000 listed, \$1,900,000 is for the County and the remaining portion will be debt that we finance for other agencies and municipalities. There are also other capital projects occurring that have other funding sources and these are for arena renovations, asset maintenance, Human Services Managed Services software and 2012 highway projects that they were looking to have funded by property taxes and also other revenue sources. These highway projects were the projects that the PD & T Committee looked at for reduction of a portion. Internal Auditor Sara Perrizo stated that PD & T took \$642,210 out of property tax and put it on the bond and this recommendation was passed on to the Administration Committee from PD & T.

County Executive Troy Streckenbach asked if this was for one or more highway projects. Maricque stated that the largest project would be for the County HC project for \$557,000 and she noted that a portion of that project is already in 2013. She did state that the amount that was reduced at PD & T was more than that project.

Lund asked if the portion for library renovations included the repairs needed for the elevator system. Streckenbach stated that if the library's budget is approved by the Board, bonding of \$1,979,000 would not be necessary for the library and that the \$1,979,000 does include elevator repairs. Streckenbach stated if this was approved in the operations budget, there would \$375,000 less that would need to be bonded for in 2012. If it is not approved and operational maintenance items are taken out of the budget, and it needs to be bonded, then at least it is fully disclosed and transparent. Streckenbach stated that his goal is to keep the elevator repairs in the operational budget as he would rather not pay for it by bonding. Streckenbach stated that the whole bonding debt plan is that the principal that is being paid off is less than what we are bonding for and he felt that this would be at risk if we decide to take out capital projects and put it back into bonding.

Streckenbach passed out a graph outlining the total outstanding general obligation debt, a copy of which is attached. He stated that the goal is to see true property tax relief and see our tax rate decrease and he felt that one of the best ways to do this as a community is shown on the graph. He felt that if we do not start now, it will simply prolong it another year. If we are looking to provide property tax relief and provide a tax rate that will reduce, we have to start somewhere, but not with a large hit at one time. He believes there needs to be a strategic plan over the course of years. Streckenbach stated that he did not feel we would get to a better spot if we continue to bond for projects year after year. At some point in time we have to make a commitment to move funds over to cover these expenses. The strategy of his budget is to make tough deep cuts in 2012 so that in 2013 we have applied roughly \$2,000,000 to maintenance, operations and roads. This would also allow the ability to handle any problems that would arise with regard to revenues or absorbing expenses. This would allow the possibility of hiring more staff in areas that are deficient or be able to foster employee morale by looking at an increase in wages. Currently we have to transfer in \$1,200,000 to cover debt service. Maricque explained that the \$300,000 will probably happen again next year, but the other \$900,000 came from excess funds from projects, so this may be a number we will not see next year, unless there are more projects that were over bonded.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to approve Capital Projects 2012 Budget. Vote taken. Ayes: Lund, Theisen, Schuller, Tumpach, Nays: Miller. MOTION CARRIED 4 - 1

12. Taxes, Special Revenues, Certain Internal Service & Fiduciary Funds.

Carolyn Maricque referred the Committee's attention to Pages 269 – 285 of the budget book and further stated that the amounts going into the general fund are shown on Page 270. She noted that

the transfer in is from the Sheriff's Department and this is due to them purchasing vehicles which they are paying back in 2012. She did note that the copy center is working on a deficit and this will be reviewed.

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Miller to approve the Taxes, Special Revenues, Certain Internal Service & Fiduciary Funds 2012 Budget. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Non-Budget Items

Communications

- 13. Communication from Supervisor Andrews re: That the County explore where we may use tablet devices, for staff and elected officials, as our method of accepting data in an effort to reduce our paper printing and postage costs. *Referred from September County Board.***

Supervisor Andrews stated that there are a number of counties that are going to the use of tablet devices such as iPads. Andrews explained that when you walk into the building, you are automatically logged on to the system and therefore, you would have instant access to anything online. She felt due to the large volume of paper printed, having things accessible on a tablet may be more cost-effective and she also felt the notion of going paperless should be explored. Further, having documents accessible electronically would alleviate the need to have large amounts of space to store paper documents.

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Theisen to refer to Supervisor Andrews and the Internal Auditor. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- 14. Communication from Supervisor Miller re: That the Administration Committee of the Brown County Board of Supervisors be expanded to include three Brown County high school students as non-voting members to participate in all non-closed session discussions. This would be done on an experimental basis for one year. *Motion at 9/22/11 Admin: To approve communication as amended to provide for two students to participate for three months at a time. Item referred back to committee as per the County Board 10/19/11.***

Supervisor Miller summarized the current status of this communication and stated that students recommended through the County Executive's process will be invited to participate in Committee discussions with the idea that the first hour of the meeting would be set aside to discuss items that may be of interest to them. The Committee will receive feedback from the students and their advisors/principals to see if this is of any value and if it is, it can be continued and if there was no value, we can stop. Streckenbach stated that he did have several schools that have shown interest in this and have students available. The Committee is prepared to have this begin next month and Streckenbach will have his assistant make contact with the schools to set it up.

No action taken.

County Clerk

- 15. Budget Status Financial Report for August and September, 2011.**

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Miller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Corporation Counsel

- 16. Ordinance re: Creating Section 3.31 of the Brown County Code of Ordinances to Prohibit Carrying of Firearms into County Buildings and Special Events. Motion at 9/22/11 Admin: To refer to staff for further info. Item referred back to cmte as per the County Board 10/19/11.**

Corporation Counsel John Luetscher provided the Committee with information regarding what counties in other states have done concerning firearms in county buildings, a copy of which is attached. Luetscher stated that he had proposed this ordinance which is a general ban on behalf of the administration and this ordinance maintains the status quo which is what he felt the strong preference of department heads was.

Theisen stated that research indicates that the states that have concealed carry have not shown any change in crime, either up or down. Theisen also stated that in reviewing the information provided by Luetscher, it appeared that a number of major cities do not have any such ordinance as is being proposed. Theisen felt it was a matter of fear of change and fear of the unknown. Based on his own common sense, Theisen felt that if someone intends to hurt someone with a gun, a sign on the door would not make a difference.

Erickson agreed with Theisen and stated he also believed a sign on the door will not stop someone who has intent to do harm. He felt if we really want to protect the buildings in the County, the way to do it would be with metal detectors. Erickson also recommended that staff consult with the Sheriff's Departments in the surrounding states to see how they handle this situation.

Miller thought that perhaps this should be looked at on a building by building basis and that it would be prudent to ban weapons with the exception of the Sheriff, however, he did agree with Supervisors Theisen and Erickson that a sign on the door would not prevent someone who intended to do harm from doing harm. Miller felt the only value an ordinance would have would be the value of somebody bringing in a weapon for psychological effect.

Luetscher stated that if this ordinance is not passed, he would still like the opportunity to come back with an ordinance that would pertain to select buildings where he felt he could make compelling arguments that firearms should be banned such as the CTC, Sophie Beaumont Building and Shelter Care.

Supervisor Kaster felt this was two different discussions, banning firearms or banning weapons. Banning weapons would include box cutters, fingernail files, etc. Luetscher stated that the ordinance refers to firearms specifically and that the County has no authority to ban other weapons – only firearms.

Schuller maintains his position that Corp. Counsel drafted the ordinance and makes mention that department heads and employees are in favor of the ordinance and there are municipalities and businesses and employers throughout the area that are passing similar ordinances to keep firearms out of their facilities and he felt that for the wellbeing of County employees the ordinance should be passed.

Motion made by Supervisor Miller, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to refer to Corporation Counsel to analyze on a building by building basis. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

III

17. Resolution to Approve Contracting for Outside Legal Services.

Corporation Counsel John Luetscher reported that Port and Solid Waste is presently negotiating a solid waste management services agreement with virtually all of the municipalities in Brown County and, in addition, there is a somewhat similar agreement being negotiated with private haulers. The agreement will tentatively be in effect for 10 years. Both agreements raise specific and complex legal issues and it is the desire of Corp. Counsel to have these issues reviewed by outside counsel by an attorney who has expertise and experience in sovereign immunity issues. This relates to an addendum which is part of the negotiated management services agreement with the municipalities. This is essentially an agreement that Brown County would be entering with OEI which is a Wisconsin Corporation owned by 7 Generations, an Oneida Tribal corporation.

Motion made by Supervisor Miller, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to approve. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Child Support Agency

18. Ordinance Creating Section 3.31 of the Brown County Code Entitled "Child Support Agency Fees".

Corporation Counsel John Luetscher drafted this ordinance for the former director of the Child Support Agency. There is a state law that allows the County to charge certain fees for various tasks that the CSA provides. Luetscher stated that the revenue this would generate is fairly modest.

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Miller to approve. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Treasurer

19. Budget Status Financial Report for September, 2011.

Blaney stated that revenue continues to come in above budget and expenditures continue to be below budget.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

20. Treasurer's Financial Report for the Month of August, 2011.

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Miller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

21. Budget Adjustment Request (11-120): Increase in expenses with offsetting increase in revenue.

Blaney stated that this relates to the cost of banking services and the purpose of the adjustment is to create a separate expense line category for bank service charges.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

22. Opening of tax deed bills.

Chair Lund opened the bids received and they are as follows:

-Parcel HB-1323-1-4 - Bid by the Oneida Nation of Wisconsin of \$250.00 (\$25.00 down payment received)

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to approve bid by the Oneida Nation of Wisconsin of \$250.00 for Parcel HB-1323-1-4. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

-Parcel VH-748 - Bid by Greg Ludwig of \$750.00 (\$75.00 down payment received)

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to approve bid by Greg Ludwig of \$750.00 for Parcel VH-748. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

-Parcel VH-750 - Bid by Greg Ludwig of \$750.00 (\$75.00 down payment received)

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve bid by Greg Ludwig of \$750.00 for Parcel VH-750. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

-Parcel 1-859 – Bid by Scott Delcorps of \$500.00 (\$50.00 down payment received)
Bid by Timothy Schultz of \$1,053.00 (\$105.30 down payment received)

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve the bid of Timothy Schultz for \$1,053.00 for Parcel 1-859. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

-Parcel 9-140 – Bid by Michael Sarogg of \$2,000.00 (\$200.00 down payment received)

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve bid by Michael Sarogg of \$2,000 for Parcel 9-140. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

-Parcel 14-519 – Bid by Michael and Kristine Casperson of \$1,000.00 (\$ 100.00 down payment received)

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve bid by Michael and Kristine Casperson of \$1,000.00 for Parcel 14-519. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

-Parcel 19-624 – Bid by Javier Gasca of \$100.00 (\$100.00 received)

Motion made by Supervisor Miller, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve bid by Javier Gasca of \$100.00 for Parcel 19-624. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

-Parcel 20-436 – Bid by Ruby Mock of \$60.00 (\$60.00 received)

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve bid by Ruby Mock of \$60.00 for Parcel 20-436. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

-Parcel 21-1463 – Bid by David Catalano of \$5,300 (\$530.00 down payment enclosed)
Bid by Andy Williams of \$510.00 (\$51.00 down payment received)

III

Motion made by Supervisor Tumpach seconded by Supervisor Miller to approve bid of David Catalano of \$5,300.00 for Parcel 21-1463. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

-Parcel 21-1617 – Bid by Thomas L. Peterson of \$800.00 (\$80.00 down payment received)

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Theisen to approve bid by Thomas L. Peterson of \$800.00 for Parcel 21-1617. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

23. Director's Report.

Blaney stated that this is the time of year the Treasurer's office starts foreclosure proceedings. Foreclosures continue to increase in number each year and this year they have approximately 600.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Miller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Department of Administration

24. Budget Status Financial Report for September, 2011.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

25. 2011 Budget Adjustment Log.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Miller to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

26. Director's Report.

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Human Resources

27. Activity Report for September, 2011.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

28. Budget Status Financial Report for September, 2011.

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

29. VEBA RFP Request for Approval (project to be handed out at meeting).

Human Resource Director Debbie Klarkowski stated that this is an RFP for a health savings account that employees can use to save future dollars for healthcare under the high deductible plan.

Supervisor Miller believed this type of service was provided for free at financial institutions. Klarkowski said this is different than a health savings account. This high deductible plan functions

III

to a certain degree like a PPO. Klarkowski said that the fee is for administering the plan as it is an investment mechanism for the employee.

**Motion made by Supervisor Miller, seconded by Supervisor Theisen to approve RFP. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

30. Director's Report.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Information Services

31. Budget Status Financial Report for September, 2011.

IS Director Robert Heimann stated that as of September 30, 2011 they are at 65.63% of costs charged out to County Departments and the forecast for the end of the year is to be under budget.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

32. Budget Adjustment Request (11-123): Interdepartmental reallocation or adjustment (including reallocation from the County's General Fund).

Heimann stated that the fiber optics capital project costs were less than originally bonded for. The remainder of these funds, \$4,262, is being transferred from IS to the Sheriff's Office for installation of the fiber in the Sheriff's Office.

**Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Theisen to approve. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

33. Budget Adjustment Request (11-125): Interdepartmental reallocation or adjustment (including reallocation from the County's General Fund).

Heimann stated that this is for updates to the GIS system that is on the internet for use by the public as well as property listing and other staff. The Planning Department had funds in their department to outsource a section of the programming but it was later determined that the updates could be completed by the IS Department less expensively than hiring an outside consultant. This budget adjustment is to transfer funds from Planning and Land Services to IS to cover the overtime costs IS staff will likely incur in making these updates, which will still be less than outsourcing.

**Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

34. Director's Report.

With regard to the Director's Report contained in the agenda packet, Heimann wished to draw the Committee's attention to several items, including the Sheriff's Department Law Enforcement Records Management System. The go live date for this system has been moved from November 1 to November 29.

Heimann also stated that PCI compliance is still a concern and the position that was approved in the budget will allow staff who have the capability to work on PCI compliance to get started on this project.

Finally, he advised the Committee that his last day as IS Director for Brown County will be November 11. He thanked the Committee and Board for the time he has spent with Brown County. The Committee thanked Bob for all his work and stated that he will definitely be missed.

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Miller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

At this time Board Chairman Guy Zima addressed the Committee and Bob Heimann. Zima echoed the Committee's thanks to Heimann for the work he had done and all the money he has saved the County. Zima stated that he had personally met with Heimann in an attempt to get him to stay on with the County as it is important to have a person of his caliber to guide the IS Department. Zima asked Heimann why he made the decision to leave the County and Heimann said he was leaving due to frustration that his department was not being staffed properly and further, Heimann felt there were "time bombs" waiting in the County to go off for which he felt he would take the blame, although he had made attempts with the last two administrations to get the help the IS Department needs to address these concerns. Zima is aware of consistent complaints over the last 3 – 4 years as everyone wants and needs the services of that department, which leaves Heimann to pick and choose what to work on. Secondly, Zima stated that Heimann felt that in the public sector the salary for an IS Director was well above what he earns, but Heimann was satisfied with what he was making at Brown County and he did the job because he liked it, but he felt that he did not want to be responsible for what might happen under his leadership when the department was underfunded and under staffed. Zima felt that the IS study that was proposed earlier was something the County needs to look at. Zima felt that Heimann would like to move on to someplace where he can be utilized and appreciated and where he does not need to be afraid of what might or could happen.

Zima went on to say that Heimann said the he had enjoyed working with the staff and has generally felt support from the Board but that Administration does not seem to want to solve the problems that exist. Zima felt this was definitely something that needed attention. Zima also felt that in the future we have to listen to what our staff is telling us. Zima felt that the final straw that came for Bob was after he put together job descriptions that he was asked to put together, it was agreed these positions were necessary and then at the last minute this did not materialize.

Motion made by Supervisor Miller, seconded by Supervisor Theisen to take Corporation Counsel and Human Resources next. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Facility & Park Management

35. Budget Status Financial Report for September, 2011.

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Theisen to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

36. Budget Adjustment Request (11-139): Increase in expenses with offsetting increase in revenue.

Dowell stated that this budget adjustment is for funds received from a wind farm and will be received annually. It is proposed to spend these funds on a pool cover at Syble Hopp as there is a

III

great deal of energy being lost in not having the pool covered. Dowell felt that as much as \$10,000 could be saved annually by covering the pool.

**Motion made by Supervisor Miller, seconded by Supervisor Theisen to approve. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

37. Director's Report.

Dowell stated that they are continuing to wrap up open projects by the end of the year. They are also proceeding with MHC activity. He stated that a number of items have been sold at govdeals.com as well as at the auction held in October which netted approximately \$6,000 after the expenses of the auction. He also noted that by holding the auction they saved approximately \$5,000 - \$6,000 of expenses in dumpsters and disposal fees.

Currently the heat is not operating at the MHC and they will be proceeding to drain water lines and the plan is not to heat the building this winter. Dowell stated that they will still need approximately \$30,000 to continue on with the security on the building as well as some nominal lighting for parking lot lights and emergency lights. Dowell felt that the security guard is necessary in that if the building is not checked periodically there is a strongly likelihood that vandalism will occur. The security contract is in the neighborhood of \$14,000. Dowell also stated that they have had the Fire Marshal tour the facility and provide Facilities with a list of the various activities that will have to take place to shut the building down.

Supervisor Miller wanted to know what the possibility would be of using security cameras instead of a security guard to keep the building secure. Dowell felt that the presence of the security guard was important and stated that the security contract provides for three or four rounds of the MHC during the second and third shift. Miller wanted to know if the status quo was being maintained in the hopes of selling the building. Dowell stated that the Facilities Masterplan Subcommittee is of the opinion that the building should be demolished, but the cost of that is approximately \$1,500,000 which has not been budgeted for. Obviously the preference would be to sell the building, however, they have been attempting to sell the building for two years and although there have been several interested parties, no offers or letters of intent have been forthcoming. Some of the interested parties are simply interested in the property and not the building itself.

Carole Andrews, Chair of the Facilities Masterplan Subcommittee, stated that they are proceeding along several lines such as working on something with the City of Green Bay and a TIF district, demolishing the building and attempting to sell the building.

Lund stated that the County would be willing to sell the property only, and if that is done, we would deduct the cost of demolition from the property sale. He felt it would not be prudent to spend funds to demolish the property without even knowing if there would be a payback.

Erickson's opinion was that it would be difficult to find anyone interested in the old section of the building as it's in pretty bad shape. He also stated that he thought last year it was voted to end all funding for the MHC in June. Lund stated that that was correct, but then there was another vote to continue funding through the end of the year.

Schuller asked Streckenbach what was happening with attempts to market the property. Streckenbach answered that Chuck Lamine is currently in the process of preparing an RFQ for a broker. Streckenbach also reaffirmed that there are several different options being discussed to come to a long term solution. He also stated that to some degree this is a liability and it needs to

III

be maintained to a certain level for several different reasons, including the fact that there is mold and asbestos in the building as well as security issues and thus, there is a cost to owning a vacant building.

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Theisen to reconsider the Facility Management budget. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Lund to add \$30,000 to the Facility Management 2012 Budget to maintain MHC building for a period of one year. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to approve the Facility Management 2012 Budget as amended. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Miller to receive and place director's report on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Other

38. Audit of bills.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to pay bills. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

39. Discussion of meeting date for November, 2011; scheduled November 24, 2011 (Thanksgiving).

Motion made by Supervisor Tumpach, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to hold the next Administration Committee meeting on November 17, 2011 at 5:30 p.m. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

40. Such other matters as authorized by law.

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Schuller to adjourn at 10:25 p.m. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio
Recording Secretary

III

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a special meeting of the **Brown County Administration Committee** was held on Monday, November 7, 2011 in Room 210 of City Hall –Jefferson Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Tom Lund, Robert Miller, Mark Tumpach, Kris Schuller, Tony Theisen

Also Present: Debbie Klarkowski

1. **Call Meeting to Order:**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Tom Lund at 8:45 a.m.

2. **Approve/Modify Agenda.**

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **Budget Adjustment Request (11-131): Adjustment to increase maintenance agreement software for amount that was prepaid at the end of 2012 but expensed in 2011 – Child Support Agency.**

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Miller to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **Budget Adjustment Request (11-132): Adjustment to move dollars for the Jail Fencing project currently in the Sheriff's outlay budget to outlay in Facilities Management to supplement other outlay dollars reallocated for this project – Sheriff and Facility Management.**

Motion made by Supervisor Miller, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. **Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions During the 2012 Budget Process (IS).**

Motion made by Supervisor Schuller, seconded by Supervisor Theisen to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. **Such other matters as authorized by law.**

Motion made by Supervisor Theisen, seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to adjourn at 8:55 a.m. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia A. Loehlein
Recording Secretary

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY FACILITY MASTER PLAN
SUBCOMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a meeting of the **Facility Master Plan Subcommittee** was held on Thursday, October 20, 2011 at 4:00 p.m. in Room 200, Northern Building, 305 East Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Chair Carole Andrews, Mike Fleck, Bill Clancy
Excused: Pat Wetzel
Also Present: Bill Dowell, Doug Marsh, Chuck Lamine

1. **Call to Order.**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Andrews at 4:04 p.m.

2. **Approve/Modify Agenda.**

A motion was made by Supervisor Fleck, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to approve the agenda. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

3. **Approve/Modify Minutes of September 15, 2011.**

A motion was made by Supervisor Clancy, seconded by Supervisor Fleck to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

4. **Comments from the Public.**

No public present.

5. **Update on former Mental Health Center building.**

Facilities Director Bill Dowell provided the Committee with a chart outlining the carrying costs of the MHC, a copy of which is attached. The upper portion of the handout outlines the costs associated with heating the building this winter. The lower half pertains to the carrying costs without heating the building. The estimated annual carrying costs if the building were to be heated would be \$113,640 annually, or \$9,470 per month. There would also be a one-time boiler inspection and startup fee of approximately \$5,000. The carrying costs without heating the building would be approximately \$29,858 annually or \$2,488 per month.

Dowell stated that he felt the security was very important and did not recommend eliminating it. Currently a contracted security company makes rounds of the building during the second and third shifts. Electricity is also necessary for emergency lighting and emergency exits inside the building as well as the exterior parking lot lights. Dowell also stated that there are four sump pumps in the tunnel that will need to continue operating.

Dowell also passed out a letter from the City of Green Bay Fire Marshals Division, a copy of which is attached. This letter outlines what will need to be done to shut the building down.

Dowell advised the Committee that there is currently water in three separate systems including steam lines, chilled water lines and potable water lines. All three of these systems need to be

drained and Dowell was confident that all water from the steam line could be drained however, he stated that some water could remain in the other lines which could lead to frozen pipes.

Dowell stated his understanding was that the goal was to attempt to sell the building, and if this did not materialize, efforts would continue for demolition. He did point out however that no monies had been budgeted for abatement and demolition of the building and no monies had been authorized for heating the building this winter either.

Supervisor Fleck asked if there was any more interest from the Milwaukee group that had toured the building. Planning Director Chuck Lamine stated that he had not spoken with them recently however in the last contact he had with this group, he got the impression that they may be interested in the real estate, but not the building.

Lamine also reported that he had recently had a meeting with the City of Green Bay planning and economic development staff and that the meeting went well. His thought was that one mechanism to come up with funding to tear the MHC down would be to create a TIF district on the real estate and it is was his understanding that the City of Green Bay was exploring the potential of a TIF district in the area of the MHC as well. Lamine stated the consensus was that there would not be sufficient tax valuation on just the MHC property to pay for the cost of abatement and demolition and therefore a better approach would be to look at the creation of a TIF district. The meeting with the City also included a discussion with staff about the possibility of developing the vacant property adjacent to the MHC and Lamine felt the City was interested in different concepts such as creation of a business park with an energy efficient element to it. He felt it would be worthwhile to set up another meeting with Advance from the Chamber of Commerce and also invite commercial brokers and developers and get their insights as to what kind of use might be possible for the vacant property. Lamine's thoughts include creating a tax base, creating jobs and creating a tax increment that could be used to help pay for the costs of demolition.

Lamine stated that the other thing he was asked to do was put together an RFQ for a commercial real estate broker. He provided this Subcommittee with a copy of what he had prepared, but noted that this was only a draft and had not been reviewed by Purchasing yet. Lamine pointed out that if the MHC is sold to a non-profit, it will not generate any tax and therefore there would not be any tax increment to cover the demolition costs. His intent in the RFQ was to preserve the right for the County to determine who's going to end up on the site. Lamine outlined some of the other requirements in this proposed RFQ and stated that this is a starting point which will be forwarded to the Purchasing Department for finalization. Lamine asked this Subcommittee to review the proposed document and provide any comments they had to him. Lamine further explained that this would be an independent effort to creating a TIF district. He would not necessarily like to see a long standing tie with a broker because the TIF process would enable the County to have administrative funds, marketing funds, design funds and the infrastructure and demolition funds and it was his opinion that that is a more holistic look at the whole area and would also create a nice partnership between the County and the City.

Chair Andrews asked if her understanding that nobody was really interested in the building was accurate and Engineer Doug Marsh stated that he was aware of about a half dozen inquiries since mid-June, the strongest of which was the group from Milwaukee. He did note, however, that no offers or letters of intent had been received from any group and Dowell added that no group had made a second visit. Lamine also stated that an RFI was done in 2009 and an RFO was done in 2010

1A

and the property had been listed on real estate sites since then. He felt that due diligence had been done to make people aware that the building is available. Dowell stated that anyone who would occupy the building would need to do a major renovation which would include replacing the boiler and also any pipes that would freeze.

Motion made by Supervisor Clancy, seconded by Supervisor Fleck to move forward with the RFQ process for a broker and also to have Doug Marsh contact each of the parties that had expressed interest in the MHC to see if there is continued interest prior to the next Administration Committee meeting. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Dowell asked if the Subcommittee was comfortable with the plan to drain the water lines. The Subcommittee was in agreement with this and Andrews pointed out that since the boiler would need to be replaced by anyone who purchased the building, no damage would be done that wouldn't already have to be fixed.

Doug Marsh provided the Subcommittee with an update on the MHC property, a copy of which is attached. Items shaded in gray are items that have been updated since the last report was handed out at the September meeting. He did note that since the last meeting he had been contacted by a minority single mother from Green Bay who was interested in launching an assisted living center. Marsh provided her with information and directed her to the UWGB Small Business Development Center and the FVTC Venture Center as well as Raasch Associates. Marsh also provided a handout on the Auction/Move costs which is also attached.

Marsh stated that with regard to sale of the fixtures and furnishings, to date there had been 30 postings on govdeals.com which had resulted in the sale of 42 items for a total of \$12,458. Marsh also reported on the auction held on October 4 and stated that items to be sold were moved to the Fairgrounds in an ambitious move over four days utilizing six movers from Space Makers, six Huber inmates and three trucks. Eighty-nine percent of the auction items were sold and a check was received for the proceeds of \$2,619.75. Following the auction, County Departments came through and took items for their Departments and then some Brown County based non-profit organizations were able to select items. The second day after the auction Salvation Army and Fox Valley Thrift Store picked up items they were interested in and the remaining items were sent to a landfill. Marsh estimated that between \$6,400 and \$10,640 in tipping fees were avoided by holding the auction and selling the items rather than disposing of them. Supervisor Clancy asked how well the auction was attended and Marsh stated that at least 60 bid cards were issued. There are still several items remaining in the MHC that will be listed on govdeals.com and these consist of some kitchen equipment and fixed items.

Marsh continued by providing an update for the abatement of the building and stated that on August 22 AECOM toured the building to prepare pre-demolition specifications which were received by Marsh on September 16. AECOM quoted \$2,500 to draft an RFP for the services listed on page three of Marsh's handout. Lamine also stated that the County Planning Commission will be applying for additional environmental site assessment plans. Marsh stated that the fees to perform services designated in an RFP are estimated to be \$20,000 - \$40,000 while abatement is estimated to be in the area of \$250,000 - \$300,000.

Motion made by Supervisor Fleck, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

1a

6. **Report of the Facilities Director.**

Facilities Director Bill Dowell stated that his Department is continuing to complete projects that were scheduled for the year. Since the last meeting final training and acceptance of the last two solar projects has been completed. Marsh is continuing to work on documentation to get the final grant funds for these projects.

**Motion made by Supervisor Clancy, seconded by Supervisor Fleck to receive and place on file.
Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

7. **Such other matters as authorized by law.**

Motion made by Supervisor Clancy, seconded by Supervisor Fleck to adjourn at 5:55 p.m. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio
Recording Secretary

1a

October 19, 2011

**TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Ladies & Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE 2012-2013 MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF EATON FOR THE STATEWIDE
VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM (SVRS)**

WHEREAS, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) to create a more uniform voter registration and voting system in the United States; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board (GAB) is charged with implementing a Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS) that complies with HAVA; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Eaton, a local unit of government, understands its obligations and commitments as mandated by HAVA and state statutes to implement and administer local voter registration; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government is required to maintain the local voter registration information within the centralized SVRS and the Town of Eaton established an initial relier agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office to accept this responsibility for elections held since 2006; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government has opted to renew its SVRS provider agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office for elections held in 2012 and 2013; and

WHEREAS, the cost of administering a voter registration system is dependent upon the requirements of the system acquired by the State of Wisconsin, of which the costs estimated by

the Brown County Clerk to the local unit of government is based on the municipality's latest estimated census at a rate of \$.23 per person for each election.

THEREFORE, the Town of Eaton directs the Chair to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Brown County to provide support staff for efficient and cost effective services that comply with HAVA and, where appropriate, incorporate the sharing of technology and resources.

FURTHER RESOLVE that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Government Accountability Board in recognition of the Town of Eaton fulfilling its HAVA requirements.

Fiscal Impact: None

2012-2013 Agreement	2012 – Four Elections	2013 – Two Elections
Revenue- Chargeback	\$1387.36	\$693.68
Expense-Clerk Typist I (LTE)	(\$1387.36)	(\$693.68)

Fiscal Note - This resolution does not require an appropriation from the General Fund. Municipal revenues for elections have been included in the County Clerk's 2012 budget and will also be included in the 2013 budget.

Respectfully Submitted,

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approved By:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Authored by: County Clerk

Final Draft Approved by Corporation Counsel

**MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF
EATON FOR THE STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM**

This Memorandum of Understanding is hereby entered into by and between Brown County and the Town of Eaton.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the terms and conditions contained herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. The Town of Eaton understands that the State intends to maintain the official centralized database of voter registration information.
2. The Town of Eaton understands their responsibilities and requirements for complying with HAVA and state statutes and accepts the responsibility to implement voter registration policies and procedures and maintain each voter's current registration documentation.
3. The Town of Eaton understands the technology, technology maintenance, staffing, and training costs that are required of Brown County to accept the responsibility of updating the SVRS. The estimated cost per election is provided and agreed upon by both parties.
4. Based on the above, the Town of Eaton herein declares its intention to utilize staff, technology, and resources of Brown County and share in the responsibilities and costs associated with the administration of SVRS and this sharing agreement.
5. This agreement is valid from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2013. In addition, this agreement will be extended in 90 day increments unless officially terminated. This agreement can only be officially terminated if the following guidelines have been met:
 - a. Both parties to the agreement have notified the Government Accountability Board 90 days prior to the agreement being terminated.
 - b. The Town of Eaton or new provider (municipality or county) assuming responsibility for updating the SVRS, has purchased the appropriate equipment and validated with the Government Accountability Board that they are capable of taking on the technology and resource responsibilities of the SVRS.
 - c. The Town of Eaton or new provider (municipality or county) has validated with the Government Accountability Board that their clerks and appointed associates have been properly trained in the use and functions of the SVRS.

Irvin Saharsky, Town of Eaton Chairman

Date

Darlene K. Marcelle, Brown County Clerk

Date

October 19, 2011

**TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Ladies & Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE 2012-2013 MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF HOLLAND FOR THE
STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM (SVRS)**

WHEREAS, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) to create a more uniform voter registration and voting system in the United States; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board (GAB) is charged with implementing a Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS) that complies with HAVA; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Holland, a local unit of government, understands its obligations and commitments as mandated by HAVA and state statutes to implement and administer local voter registration; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government is required to maintain the local voter registration information within the centralized SVRS and the Town of Holland established an initial relier agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office to accept this responsibility for elections held since 2006; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government has opted to renew its SVRS provider agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office for elections held in 2012 and 2013; and

WHEREAS, the cost of administering a voter registration system is dependent upon the requirements of the system acquired by the State of Wisconsin, of which the costs estimated by

the Brown County Clerk to the local unit of government is based on the municipality's latest estimated census at a rate of \$.23 per person for each election.

THEREFORE, the Town of Holland directs the Chair to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Brown County to provide support staff for efficient and cost effective services that comply with HAVA and, where appropriate, incorporate the sharing of technology and resources.

FURTHER RESOLVE that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Government Accountability Board in recognition of the Town of Holland fulfilling its HAVA requirements.

Fiscal Impact: None

2012-2013 Agreement	2012 – Four Elections	2013 – Two Elections
Revenue- Chargeback	\$1397.48	\$698.74
Expense-Clerk Typist I (LTE)	(\$1397.48)	(\$698.74)

Fiscal Note - This resolution does not require an appropriation from the General Fund. Municipal revenues for elections have been included in the County Clerk's 2012 budget and will also be included in the 2013 budget.

Respectfully Submitted,

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approved By:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Authored by: County Clerk

Final Draft Approved by Corporation Counsel

**MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF
HOLLAND FOR THE STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM**

This Memorandum of Understanding is hereby entered into by and between Brown County and the Town of Holland.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the terms and conditions contained herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. The Town of Holland understands that the State intends to maintain the official centralized database of voter registration information.
2. The Town of Holland understands their responsibilities and requirements for complying with HAVA and state statutes and accepts the responsibility to implement voter registration policies and procedures and maintain each voter's current registration documentation.
3. The Town of Holland understands the technology, technology maintenance, staffing, and training costs that are required of Brown County to accept the responsibility of updating the SVRS. The estimated cost per election is provided and agreed upon by both parties.
4. Based on the above, the Town of Holland herein declares its intention to utilize staff, technology, and resources of Brown County and share in the responsibilities and costs associated with the administration of SVRS and this sharing agreement.
5. This agreement is valid from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2013. In addition, this agreement will be extended in 90 day increments unless officially terminated. This agreement can only be officially terminated if the following guidelines have been met:
 - a. Both parties to the agreement have notified the Government Accountability Board 90 days prior to the agreement being terminated.
 - b. The Town of Holland or new provider (municipality or county) assuming responsibility for updating the SVRS, has purchased the appropriate equipment and validated with the Government Accountability Board that they are capable of taking on the technology and resource responsibilities of the SVRS.
 - c. The Town of Holland or new provider (municipality or county) has validated with the Government Accountability Board that their clerks and appointed associates have been properly trained in the use and functions of the SVRS.

Jerome Wall, Town of Holland Chairman

Date

Darlene K. Marcelle, Brown County Clerk

Date

October 19, 2011

**TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Ladies & Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE 2012-2013 MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF HUMBOLDT FOR THE
STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM (SVRS)**

WHEREAS, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) to create a more uniform voter registration and voting system in the United States; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board (GAB) is charged with implementing a Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS) that complies with HAVA; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Humboldt, a local unit of government, understands its obligations and commitments as mandated by HAVA and state statutes to implement and administer local voter registration; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government is required to maintain the local voter registration information within the centralized SVRS and the Town of Humboldt established an initial relier agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office to accept this responsibility for elections held since 2006; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government has opted to renew its SVRS provider agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office for elections held in 2012 and 2013; and

WHEREAS, the cost of administering a voter registration system is dependent upon the requirements of the system acquired by the State of Wisconsin, of which the costs estimated by the Brown County Clerk to the local unit of government is based on the municipality's latest estimated census at a rate of \$.23 per person for each election.

THEREFORE, the Town of Humboldt directs the Chair to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Brown County to provide support staff for efficient and cost effective services that comply with HAVA and, where appropriate, incorporate the sharing of technology and resources.

FURTHER RESOLVE that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Government Accountability Board in recognition of the Town of Humboldt fulfilling its HAVA requirements.

Fiscal Impact: None

2012-2013 Agreement	2012 – Four Elections	2013 – Two Elections
Revenue- Chargeback	\$1206.12	\$603.06
Expense-Clerk Typist I (LTE)	(\$1206.12)	(\$603.06)

Fiscal Note - This resolution does not require an appropriation from the General Fund. Municipal revenues for elections have been included in the County Clerk's 2012 budget and will also be included in the 2013 budget.

Respectfully Submitted,

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approved By:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Authored by: County Clerk

Final Draft Approved by Corporation Counsel

**MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE
TOWN OF HUMBOLDT FOR THE STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM**

This Memorandum of Understanding is hereby entered into by and between Brown County and the Town of Humboldt.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the terms and conditions contained herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. The Town of Humboldt understands that the State intends to maintain the official centralized database of voter registration information.
2. The Town of Humboldt understands their responsibilities and requirements for complying with HAVA and state statutes and accepts the responsibility to implement voter registration policies and procedures and maintain each voter's current registration documentation.
3. The Town of Humboldt understands the technology, technology maintenance, staffing, and training costs that are required of Brown County to accept the responsibility of updating the SVRS. The estimated cost per election is provided and agreed upon by both parties.
4. Based on the above, the Town of Humboldt herein declares its intention to utilize staff, technology, and resources of Brown County and share in the responsibilities and costs associated with the administration of SVRS and this sharing agreement.
5. This agreement is valid from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2013. In addition, this agreement will be extended in 90 day increments unless officially terminated. This agreement can only be officially terminated if the following guidelines have been met:
 - a. Both parties to the agreement have notified the Government Accountability Board 90 days prior to the agreement being terminated.
 - b. The Town of Humboldt or new provider (municipality or county) assuming responsibility for updating the SVRS, has purchased the appropriate equipment and validated with the Government Accountability Board that they are capable of taking on the technology and resource responsibilities of the SVRS.
 - c. The Town of Humboldt or new provider (municipality or county) has validated with the Government Accountability Board that their clerks and appointed associates have been properly trained in the use and functions of the SVRS.

Norbert Dantine, Jr., Town of Humboldt Chairman

Date

Darlene K. Marcelle, Brown County Clerk

Date

October 19, 2011

**TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Ladies & Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE 2012-2013 MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF LAWRENCE FOR THE
STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM (SVRS)**

WHEREAS, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) to create a more uniform voter registration and voting system in the United States; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board (GAB) is charged with implementing a Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS) that complies with HAVA; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Lawrence, a local unit of government, understands its obligations and commitments as mandated by HAVA and state statutes to implement and administer local voter registration; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government is required to maintain the local voter registration information within the centralized SVRS and the Town of Lawrence established an initial relier agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office to accept this responsibility for elections held since 2006; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government has opted to renew its SVRS provider agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office for elections held in 2012 and 2013; and

WHEREAS, the cost of administering a voter registration system is dependent upon the requirements of the system acquired by the State of Wisconsin, of which the costs estimated by

the Brown County Clerk to the local unit of government is based on the municipality's latest estimated census at a rate of \$.23 per person for each election.

THEREFORE, the Town of Lawrence directs the Chair to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Brown County to provide support staff for efficient and cost effective services that comply with HAVA and, where appropriate, incorporate the sharing of technology and resources.

FURTHER RESOLVE that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Government Accountability Board in recognition of the Town of Lawrence fulfilling its HAVA requirements.

Fiscal Impact: None

2012-2013 Agreement	2012 – Four Elections	2013 – Two Elections
Revenue- Chargeback	\$3941.28	\$1970.64
Expense-Clerk Typist I (LTE)	(\$3941.28)	(\$1970.64)

Fiscal Note - This resolution does not require an appropriation from the General Fund. Municipal revenues for elections have been included in the County Clerk's 2012 budget and will also be included in the 2013 budget.

Respectfully Submitted,

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approved By:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Authored by: County Clerk

Final Draft Approved by Corporation Counsel

**MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF
LAWRENCE FOR THE STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM**

This Memorandum of Understanding is hereby entered into by and between Brown County and the Town of Lawrence.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the terms and conditions contained herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. The Town of Lawrence understands that the State intends to maintain the official centralized database of voter registration information.
2. The Town of Lawrence understands their responsibilities and requirements for complying with HAVA and state statutes and accepts the responsibility to implement voter registration policies and procedures and maintain each voter's current registration documentation.
3. The Town of Lawrence understands the technology, technology maintenance, staffing, and training costs that are required of Brown County to accept the responsibility of updating the SVRS. The estimated cost per election is provided and agreed upon by both parties.
4. Based on the above, the Town of Lawrence herein declares its intention to utilize staff, technology, and resources of Brown County and share in the responsibilities and costs associated with the administration of SVRS and this sharing agreement.
5. This agreement is valid from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2013. In addition, this agreement will be extended in 90 day increments unless officially terminated. This agreement can only be officially terminated if the following guidelines have been met:
 - a. Both parties to the agreement have notified the Government Accountability Board 90 days prior to the agreement being terminated.
 - b. The Town of Lawrence or new provider (municipality or county) assuming responsibility for updating the SVRS, has purchased the appropriate equipment and validated with the Government Accountability Board that they are capable of taking on the technology and resource responsibilities of the SVRS.
 - c. The Town of Lawrence or new provider (municipality or county) has validated with the Government Accountability Board that their clerks and appointed associates have been properly trained in the use and functions of the SVRS.

John Klasen, Town of Lawrence Chairman

Date

Darlene K. Marcelle, Brown County Clerk

Date

October 19, 2011

**TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Ladies & Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE 2012-2013 MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF MORRISON FOR THE
STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM (SVRS)**

WHEREAS, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) to create a more uniform voter registration and voting system in the United States; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board (GAB) is charged with implementing a Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS) that complies with HAVA; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Morrison, a local unit of government, understands its obligations and commitments as mandated by HAVA and state statutes to implement and administer local voter registration; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government is required to maintain the local voter registration information within the centralized SVRS and the Town of Morrison established an initial relier agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office to accept this responsibility for elections held since 2006; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government has opted to renew its SVRS provider agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office for elections held in 2012 and 2013; and

WHEREAS, the cost of administering a voter registration system is dependent upon the requirements of the system acquired by the State of Wisconsin, of which the costs estimated by

the Brown County Clerk to the local unit of government is based on the municipality's latest estimated census at a rate of \$.23 per person for each election.

THEREFORE, the Town of Morrison directs the Chair to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Brown County to provide support staff for efficient and cost effective services that comply with HAVA and, where appropriate, incorporate the sharing of technology and resources.

FURTHER RESOLVE that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Government Accountability Board in recognition of the Town of Morrison fulfilling its HAVA requirements.

Fiscal Impact: None

2012-2013 Agreement	2012 – Four Elections	2013 – Two Elections
Revenue- Chargeback	\$1471.08	\$735.54
Expense-Clerk Typist I (LTE)	(\$1471.08)	(\$735.54)

Fiscal Note - This resolution does not require an appropriation from the General Fund. Municipal revenues for elections have been included in the County Clerk's 2012 budget and will also be included in the 2013 budget.

Respectfully Submitted,

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approved By:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Authored by: County Clerk

Final Draft Approved by Corporation Counsel

MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF MORRISON FOR THE STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM

This Memorandum of Understanding is hereby entered into by and between Brown County and the Town of Morrison.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the terms and conditions contained herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. The Town of Morrison understands that the State intends to maintain the official centralized database of voter registration information.
2. The Town of Morrison understands their responsibilities and requirements for complying with HAVA and state statutes and accepts the responsibility to implement voter registration policies and procedures and maintain each voter's current registration documentation.
3. The Town of Morrison understands the technology, technology maintenance, staffing, and training costs that are required of Brown County to accept the responsibility of updating the SVRS. The estimated cost per election is provided and agreed upon by both parties.
4. Based on the above, the Town of Morrison herein declares its intention to utilize staff, technology, and resources of Brown County and share in the responsibilities and costs associated with the administration of SVRS and this sharing agreement.
5. This agreement is valid from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2013. In addition, this agreement will be extended in 90 day increments unless officially terminated. This agreement can only be officially terminated if the following guidelines have been met:
 - a. Both parties to the agreement have notified the Government Accountability Board 90 days prior to the agreement being terminated.
 - b. The Town of Morrison or new provider (municipality or county) assuming responsibility for updating the SVRS, has purchased the appropriate equipment and validated with the Government Accountability Board that they are capable of taking on the technology and resource responsibilities of the SVRS.
 - c. The Town of Morrison or new provider (municipality or county) has validated with the Government Accountability Board that their clerks and appointed associates have been properly trained in the use and functions of the SVRS.

Todd Christensen, Town of Morrison Chairman

Date

Darlene K. Marcelle, Brown County Clerk

Date

October 19, 2011

**TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Ladies & Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE 2012-2013 MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF NEW DENMARK FOR THE
STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM (SVRS)**

WHEREAS, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) to create a more uniform voter registration and voting system in the United States; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board (GAB) is charged with implementing a Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS) that complies with HAVA; and

WHEREAS, the Town of New Denmark, a local unit of government, understands its obligations and commitments as mandated by HAVA and state statutes to implement and administer local voter registration; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government is required to maintain the local voter registration information within the centralized SVRS and the Town of New Denmark established an initial relier agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office to accept this responsibility for elections held since 2006; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government has opted to renew its SVRS provider agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office for elections held in 2012 and 2013; and

WHEREAS, the cost of administering a voter registration system is dependent upon the requirements of the system acquired by the State of Wisconsin, of which the costs estimated by the Brown County Clerk to the local unit of government is based on the municipality's latest estimated census at a rate of \$.23 per person for each election.

THEREFORE, the Town of New Denmark directs the Chair to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Brown County to provide support staff for efficient and cost effective services that comply with HAVA and, where appropriate, incorporate the sharing of technology and resources.

FURTHER RESOLVE that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Government Accountability Board in recognition of the Town of New Denmark fulfilling its HAVA requirements.

Fiscal Impact: None

2012-2013 Agreement	2012 – Four Elections	2013 – Two Elections
Revenue- Chargeback	\$1417.72	\$708.86
Expense-Clerk Typist I (LTE)	(\$1417.72)	(\$708.86)

Fiscal Note - This resolution does not require an appropriation from the General Fund. Municipal revenues for elections have been included in the County Clerk's 2012 budget and will also be included in the 2013 budget.

Respectfully Submitted,

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approved By:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Authored by: County Clerk

Final Draft Approved by Corporation Counsel

**MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF
NEW DENMARK FOR THE STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM**

This Memorandum of Understanding is hereby entered into by and between Brown County and the Town of New Denmark.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the terms and conditions contained herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. The Town of New Denmark understands that the State intends to maintain the official centralized database of voter registration information.
2. The Town of New Denmark understands their responsibilities and requirements for complying with HAVA and state statutes and accepts the responsibility to implement voter registration policies and procedures and maintain each voter's current registration documentation.
3. The Town of New Denmark understands the technology, technology maintenance, staffing, and training costs that are required of Brown County to accept the responsibility of updating the SVRS. The estimated cost per election is provided and agreed upon by both parties.
4. Based on the above, the Town of New Denmark herein declares its intention to utilize staff, technology, and resources of Brown County and share in the responsibilities and costs associated with the administration of SVRS and this sharing agreement.
5. This agreement is valid from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2013. In addition, this agreement will be extended in 90 day increments unless officially terminated. This agreement can only be officially terminated if the following guidelines have been met:
 - a. Both parties to the agreement have notified the Government Accountability Board 90 days prior to the agreement being terminated.
 - b. The Town of New Denmark or new provider (municipality or county) assuming responsibility for updating the SVRS, has purchased the appropriate equipment and validated with the Government Accountability Board that they are capable of taking on the technology and resource responsibilities of the SVRS.
 - c. The Town of New Denmark or new provider (municipality or county) has validated with the Government Accountability Board that their clerks and appointed associates have been properly trained in the use and functions of the SVRS.

William Krueger, Town of New Denmark Chairman

Date

Darlene K. Marcelle, Brown County Clerk

Date

October 19, 2011

**TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Ladies & Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE 2012-2013 MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF PITTSFIELD FOR THE
STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM (SVRS)**

WHEREAS, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) to create a more uniform voter registration and voting system in the United States; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board (GAB) is charged with implementing a Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS) that complies with HAVA; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Pittsfield, a local unit of government, understands its obligations and commitments as mandated by HAVA and state statutes to implement and administer local voter registration; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government is required to maintain the local voter registration information within the centralized SVRS and the Town of Pittsfield established an initial relier agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office to accept this responsibility for elections held since 2006; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government has opted to renew its SVRS provider agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office for elections held in 2012 and 2013; and

WHEREAS, the cost of administering a voter registration system is dependent upon the requirements of the system acquired by the State of Wisconsin, of which the costs estimated by

the Brown County Clerk to the local unit of government is based on the municipality's latest estimated census at a rate of \$.23 per person for each election.

THEREFORE, the Town of Pittsfield directs the Chair to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Brown County to provide support staff for efficient and cost effective services that comply with HAVA and, where appropriate, incorporate the sharing of technology and resources.

FURTHER RESOLVE that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Government Accountability Board in recognition of the Town of Pittsfield fulfilling its HAVA requirements.

Fiscal Impact: None

2012-2013 Agreement	2012 – Four Elections	2013 – Two Elections
Revenue- Chargeback	\$2399.36	\$1199.68
Expense-Clerk Typist I (LTE)	(\$2399.36)	(\$1199.68)

Fiscal Note - This resolution does not require an appropriation from the General Fund. Municipal revenues for elections have been included in the County Clerk's 2012 budget and will also be included in the 2013 budget.

Respectfully Submitted,

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approved By:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Authored by: County Clerk

Final Draft Approved by Corporation Counsel

**MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF
PITTSFIELD FOR THE STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM**

This Memorandum of Understanding is hereby entered into by and between Brown County and the Town of Pittsfield.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the terms and conditions contained herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. The Town of Pittsfield understands that the State intends to maintain the official centralized database of voter registration information.
2. The Town of Pittsfield understands their responsibilities and requirements for complying with HAVA and state statutes and accepts the responsibility to implement voter registration policies and procedures and maintain each voter's current registration documentation.
3. The Town of Pittsfield understands the technology, technology maintenance, staffing, and training costs that are required of Brown County to accept the responsibility of updating the SVRS. The estimated cost per election is provided and agreed upon by both parties.
4. Based on the above, the Town of Pittsfield herein declares its intention to utilize staff, technology, and resources of Brown County and share in the responsibilities and costs associated with the administration of SVRS and this sharing agreement.
5. This agreement is valid from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2013. In addition, this agreement will be extended in 90 day increments unless officially terminated. This agreement can only be officially terminated if the following guidelines have been met:
 - a. Both parties to the agreement have notified the Government Accountability Board 90 days prior to the agreement being terminated.
 - b. The Town of Pittsfield or new provider (municipality or county) assuming responsibility for updating the SVRS, has purchased the appropriate equipment and validated with the Government Accountability Board that they are capable of taking on the technology and resource responsibilities of the SVRS.
 - c. The Town of Pittsfield or new provider (municipality or county) has validated with the Government Accountability Board that their clerks and appointed associates have been properly trained in the use and functions of the SVRS.

Keith Deneys, Town of Pittsfield Chairman

Date

Darlene K. Marcelle, Brown County Clerk

Date

October 19, 2011

**TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Ladies & Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE 2012-2013 MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF GLENMORE FOR THE
STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM (SVRS)**

WHEREAS, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) to create a more uniform voter registration and voting system in the United States; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board (GAB) is charged with implementing a Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS) that complies with HAVA; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Glenmore, a local unit of government, understands its obligations and commitments as mandated by HAVA and state statutes to implement and administer local voter registration; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government is required to maintain the local voter registration information within the centralized SVRS and the Town of Glenmore established an initial relier agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office to accept this responsibility for elections held since 2006; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government has opted to renew its SVRS provider agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office for elections held in 2012 and 2013; and

WHEREAS, the cost of administering a voter registration system is dependent upon the requirements of the system acquired by the State of Wisconsin, of which the costs estimated by the Brown County Clerk to the local unit of government is based on the municipality's latest estimated census at a rate of \$.23 per person for each election.

THEREFORE, the Town of Glenmore directs the Chair to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Brown County to provide support staff for efficient and cost effective services that comply with HAVA and, where appropriate, incorporate the sharing of technology and resources.

FURTHER RESOLVE that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Government Accountability Board in recognition of the Town of Glenmore fulfilling its HAVA requirements.

Fiscal Impact: None

2012-2013 Agreement	2012 – Four Elections	2013 – Two Elections
Revenue- Chargeback	\$1044.20	\$522.10
Expense-Clerk Typist I (LTE)	(\$1044.20)	(\$522.10)

Fiscal Note - This resolution does not require an appropriation from the General Fund. Municipal revenues for elections have been included in the County Clerk's 2012 budget and will also be included in the 2013 budget.

Respectfully Submitted,

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approved By:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Authored by: County Clerk

Final Draft Approved by Corporation Counsel

**MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF
GLENMORE FOR THE STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM**

This Memorandum of Understanding is hereby entered into by and between Brown County and the Town of Glenmore.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the terms and conditions contained herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. The Town of Glenmore understands that the State intends to maintain the official centralized database of voter registration information.
2. The Town of Glenmore understands their responsibilities and requirements for complying with HAVA and state statutes and accepts the responsibility to implement voter registration policies and procedures and maintain each voter's current registration documentation.
3. The Town of Glenmore understands the technology, technology maintenance, staffing, and training costs that are required of Brown County to accept the responsibility of updating the SVRS. The estimated cost per election is provided and agreed upon by both parties.
4. Based on the above, the Town of Glenmore herein declares its intention to utilize staff, technology, and resources of Brown County and share in the responsibilities and costs associated with the administration of SVRS and this sharing agreement.
5. This agreement is valid from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2013. In addition, this agreement will be extended in 90 day increments unless officially terminated. This agreement can only be officially terminated if the following guidelines have been met:
 - a. Both parties to the agreement have notified the Government Accountability Board 90 days prior to the agreement being terminated.
 - b. The Town of Glenmore or new provider (municipality or county) assuming responsibility for updating the SVRS, has purchased the appropriate equipment and validated with the Government Accountability Board that they are capable of taking on the technology and resource responsibilities of the SVRS.
 - c. The Town of Glenmore or new provider (municipality or county) has validated with the Government Accountability Board that their clerks and appointed associates have been properly trained in the use and functions of the SVRS.

Pat Kolarik, Town Chairman

Date

Darlene K. Marcelle, Brown County Clerk

Date

October 19, 2011

**TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Ladies & Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE 2012-2013 MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF GREEN BAY FOR THE
STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM (SVRS)**

WHEREAS, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) to create a more uniform voter registration and voting system in the United States; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board (GAB) is charged with implementing a Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS) that complies with HAVA; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Green Bay, a local unit of government, understands its obligations and commitments as mandated by HAVA and state statutes to implement and administer local voter registration; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government is required to maintain the local voter registration information within the centralized SVRS and the Town of Green Bay established an initial relier agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office to accept this responsibility for elections held since 2006; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government has opted to renew its SVRS provider agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office for elections held in 2012 and 2013; and

WHEREAS, the cost of administering a voter registration system is dependent upon the requirements of the system acquired by the State of Wisconsin, of which the costs estimated by

the Brown County Clerk to the local unit of government is based on the municipality's latest estimated census at a rate of \$.23 per person for each election.

THEREFORE, the Town of Green Bay directs the Chair to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Brown County to provide support staff for efficient and cost effective services that comply with HAVA and, where appropriate, incorporate the sharing of technology and resources.

FURTHER RESOLVE that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Government Accountability Board in recognition of the Town of Green Bay fulfilling its HAVA requirements.

Fiscal Impact: None

2012-2013 Agreement	2012 – Four Elections	2013 – Two Elections
Revenue- Chargeback	\$1872.20	\$936.10
Expense-Clerk Typist I (LTE)	(\$1872.20)	(\$936.10)

Fiscal Note - This resolution does not require an appropriation from the General Fund. Municipal revenues for elections have been included in the County Clerk's 2012 budget and will also be included in the 2013 budget.

Respectfully Submitted,

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approved By:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Authored by: County Clerk

Final Draft Approved by Corporation Counsel

**MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF
GREEN BAY FOR THE STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM**

This Memorandum of Understanding is hereby entered into by and between Brown County and the Town of Green Bay.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the terms and conditions contained herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. The Town of Green Bay understands that the State intends to maintain the official centralized database of voter registration information.
2. The Town of Green Bay understands their responsibilities and requirements for complying with HAVA and state statutes and accepts the responsibility to implement voter registration policies and procedures and maintain each voter's current registration documentation.
3. The Town of Green Bay understands the technology, technology maintenance, staffing, and training costs that are required of Brown County to accept the responsibility of updating the SVRS. The estimated cost per election is provided and agreed upon by both parties.
4. Based on the above, the Town of Green Bay herein declares its intention to utilize staff, technology, and resources of Brown County and share in the responsibilities and costs associated with the administration of SVRS and this sharing agreement.
5. This agreement is valid from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2013. In addition, this agreement will be extended in 90 day increments unless officially terminated. This agreement can only be officially terminated if the following guidelines have been met:
 - a. Both parties to the agreement have notified the Government Accountability Board 90 days prior to the agreement being terminated.
 - b. The Town of Green Bay or new provider (municipality or county) assuming responsibility for updating the SVRS, has purchased the appropriate equipment and validated with the Government Accountability Board that they are capable of taking on the technology and resource responsibilities of the SVRS.
 - c. The Town of Green Bay or new provider (municipality or county) has validated with the Government Accountability Board that their clerks and appointed associates have been properly trained in the use and functions of the SVRS.

Lee De Champs, Town of Green Bay Chairman

Date

Darlene K. Marcelle, Brown County Clerk

Date

October 19, 2011

**TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Ladies & Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE 2012-2013 MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF ROCKLAND FOR THE
STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM (SVRS)**

WHEREAS, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) to create a more uniform voter registration and voting system in the United States; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board (GAB) is charged with implementing a Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS) that complies with HAVA; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Rockland, a local unit of government, understands its obligations and commitments as mandated by HAVA and state statutes to implement and administer local voter registration; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government is required to maintain the local voter registration information within the centralized SVRS and the Town of Rockland established an initial relier agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office to accept this responsibility for elections held since 2006; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government has opted to renew its SVRS provider agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office for elections held in 2012 and 2013; and

WHEREAS, the cost of administering a voter registration system is dependent upon the requirements of the system acquired by the State of Wisconsin, of which the costs estimated by

the Brown County Clerk to the local unit of government is based on the municipality's latest estimated census at a rate of \$.23 per person for each election.

THEREFORE, the Town of Rockland directs the Chair to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Brown County to provide support staff for efficient and cost effective services that comply with HAVA and, where appropriate, incorporate the sharing of technology and resources.

FURTHER RESOLVE that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Government Accountability Board in recognition of the Town of Rockland fulfilling its HAVA requirements.

Fiscal Impact: None

2012-2013 Agreement	2012 – Four Elections	2013 – Two Elections
Revenue- Chargeback	\$1595.28	\$797.64
Expense-Clerk Typist I (LTE)	(\$1595.28)	(\$797.64)

Fiscal Note - This resolution does not require an appropriation from the General Fund. Municipal revenues for elections have been included in the County Clerk's 2012 budget and will also be included in the 2013 budget.

Respectfully Submitted,

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approved By:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Authored by: County Clerk

Final Draft Approved by Corporation Counsel

**MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF
ROCKLAND FOR THE STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM**

This Memorandum of Understanding is hereby entered into by and between Brown County and the Town of Rockland.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the terms and conditions contained herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. The Town of Rockland understands that the State intends to maintain the official centralized database of voter registration information.
2. The Town of Rockland understands their responsibilities and requirements for complying with HAVA and state statutes and accepts the responsibility to implement voter registration policies and procedures and maintain each voter's current registration documentation.
3. The Town of Rockland understands the technology, technology maintenance, staffing, and training costs that are required of Brown County to accept the responsibility of updating the SVRS. The estimated cost per election is provided and agreed upon by both parties.
4. Based on the above, the Town of Rockland herein declares its intention to utilize staff, technology, and resources of Brown County and share in the responsibilities and costs associated with the administration of SVRS and this sharing agreement.
5. This agreement is valid from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2013. In addition, this agreement will be extended in 90 day increments unless officially terminated. This agreement can only be officially terminated if the following guidelines have been met:
 - a. Both parties to the agreement have notified the Government Accountability Board 90 days prior to the agreement being terminated.
 - b. The Town of Rockland or new provider (municipality or county) assuming responsibility for updating the SVRS, has purchased the appropriate equipment and validated with the Government Accountability Board that they are capable of taking on the technology and resource responsibilities of the SVRS.
 - c. The Town of Rockland or new provider (municipality or county) has validated with the Government Accountability Board that their clerks and appointed associates have been properly trained in the use and functions of the SVRS.

Dennis J. Cashman, Town of Rockland Chairman

Date

Darlene K. Marcelle, Brown County Clerk

Date

October 19, 2011

**TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Ladies & Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE 2012-2013 MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF WRIGHTSTOWN FOR THE
STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM (SVRS)**

WHEREAS, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) to create a more uniform voter registration and voting system in the United States; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board (GAB) is charged with implementing a Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS) that complies with HAVA; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Wrightstown, a local unit of government, understands its obligations and commitments as mandated by HAVA and state statutes to implement and administer local voter registration; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government is required to maintain the local voter registration information within the centralized SVRS and the Town of Wrightstown established an initial relier agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office to accept this responsibility for elections held since 2006; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government has opted to renew its SVRS provider agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office for elections held in 2012 and 2013; and

WHEREAS, the cost of administering a voter registration system is dependent upon the requirements of the system acquired by the State of Wisconsin, of which the costs estimated by

the Brown County Clerk to the local unit of government is based on the municipality's latest estimated census at a rate of \$.23 per person for each election.

THEREFORE, the Town of Wrightstown directs the Chair to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Brown County to provide support staff for efficient and cost effective services that comply with HAVA and, where appropriate, incorporate the sharing of technology and resources.

FURTHER RESOLVE that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Government Accountability Board in recognition of the Town of Wrightstown fulfilling its HAVA requirements.

Fiscal Impact: None

2012-2013 Agreement	2012 – Four Elections	2013 – Two Elections
Revenue- Chargeback	\$2043.32	\$1021.66
Expense-Clerk Typist I (LTE)	(\$2043.32)	(\$1021.66)

Fiscal Note - This resolution does not require an appropriation from the General Fund. Municipal revenues for elections have been included in the County Clerk's 2012 budget and will also be included in the 2013 budget.

Respectfully Submitted,

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approved By:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Authored by: County Clerk

Final Draft Approved by Corporation Counsel

**MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF
WRIGHTSTOWN FOR THE STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM**

This Memorandum of Understanding is hereby entered into by and between Brown County and the Town of Wrightstown.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the terms and conditions contained herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. The Town of Wrightstown understands that the State intends to maintain the official centralized database of voter registration information.
2. The Town of Wrightstown understands their responsibilities and requirements for complying with HAVA and state statutes and accepts the responsibility to implement voter registration policies and procedures and maintain each voter's current registration documentation.
3. The Town of Wrightstown understands the technology, technology maintenance, staffing, and training costs that are required of Brown County to accept the responsibility of updating the SVRS. The estimated cost per election is provided and agreed upon by both parties.
4. Based on the above, the Town of Wrightstown herein declares its intention to utilize staff, technology, and resources of Brown County and share in the responsibilities and costs associated with the administration of SVRS and this sharing agreement.
5. This agreement is valid from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2013. In addition, this agreement will be extended in 90 day increments unless officially terminated. This agreement can only be officially terminated if the following guidelines have been met:
 - a. Both parties to the agreement have notified the Government Accountability Board 90 days prior to the agreement being terminated.
 - b. The Town of Wrightstown or new provider (municipality or county) assuming responsibility for updating the SVRS, has purchased the appropriate equipment and validated with the Government Accountability Board that they are capable of taking on the technology and resource responsibilities of the SVRS.
 - c. The Town of Wrightstown or new provider (municipality or county) has validated with the Government Accountability Board that their clerks and appointed associates have been properly trained in the use and functions of the SVRS.

William R. Verbeten, Town Chairman

Date

Darlene K. Marcelle, Brown County Clerk

Date

October 19, 2011

**TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Ladies & Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE 2012-2013 MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE VILLAGE OF DENMARK FOR THE
STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM (SVRS)**

WHEREAS, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) to create a more uniform voter registration and voting system in the United States; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board (GAB) is charged with implementing a Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS) that complies with HAVA; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Denmark, a local unit of government, understands its obligations and commitments as mandated by HAVA and state statutes to implement and administer local voter registration; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government is required to maintain the local voter registration information within the centralized SVRS and the Village of Denmark established an initial relier agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office to accept this responsibility for elections held since 2006; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government has opted to renew its SVRS provider agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office for elections held in 2012 and 2013; and

WHEREAS, the cost of administering a voter registration system is dependent upon the requirements of the system acquired by the State of Wisconsin, of which the costs estimated by

the Brown County Clerk to the local unit of government is based on the municipality's latest estimated census at a rate of \$.23 per person for each election.

THEREFORE, the Village of Denmark directs the President to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Brown County to provide support staff for efficient and cost effective services that comply with HAVA and, where appropriate, incorporate the sharing of technology and resources.

FURTHER RESOLVE that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Government Accountability Board in recognition of the Village of Denmark fulfilling its HAVA requirements.

Fiscal Impact: None

2012-2013 Agreement	2012 – Four Elections	2013 – Two Elections
Revenue- Chargeback	\$1953.16	\$976.58
Expense-Clerk Typist I (LTE)	(\$1953.16)	(\$976.58)

Fiscal Note - This resolution does not require an appropriation from the General Fund. Municipal revenues for elections have been included in the County Clerk's 2012 budget and will also be included in the 2013 budget.

Respectfully Submitted,

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approved By:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Authored by: County Clerk

Final Draft Approved by Corporation Counsel

**MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE VILLAGE
OF DENMARK FOR THE STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM**

This Memorandum of Understanding is hereby entered into by and between Brown County and the Village of Denmark.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the terms and conditions contained herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. The Village of Denmark understands that the State intends to maintain the official centralized database of voter registration information.
2. The Village of Denmark understands their responsibilities and requirements for complying with HAVA and state statutes and accepts the responsibility to implement voter registration policies and procedures and maintain each voter's current registration documentation.
3. The Village of Denmark understands the technology, technology maintenance, staffing, and training costs that are required of Brown County to accept the responsibility of updating the SVRS. The estimated cost per election is provided and agreed upon by both parties.
4. Based on the above, the Village of Denmark herein declares its intention to utilize staff, technology, and resources of Brown County and share in the responsibilities and costs associated with the administration of SVRS and this sharing agreement.
5. This agreement is valid from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2013. In addition, this agreement will be extended in 90 day increments unless officially terminated. This agreement can only be officially terminated if the following guidelines have been met:
 - a. Both parties to the agreement have notified the Government Accountability Board 90 days prior to the agreement being terminated.
 - b. The Village of Denmark or new provider (municipality or county) assuming responsibility for updating the SVRS, has purchased the appropriate equipment and validated with the Government Accountability Board that they are capable of taking on the technology and resource responsibilities of the SVRS.
 - c. The Village of Denmark or new provider (municipality or county) has validated with the Government Accountability Board that their clerks and appointed associates have been properly trained in the use and functions of the SVRS.

Roger Stein, Village President

Date

Darlene K. Marcelle, Brown County Clerk

Date

October 19, 2011

**TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Ladies & Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE 2012-2013 MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE VILLAGE OF PULASKI FOR THE
STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM (SVRS)**

WHEREAS, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) to create a more uniform voter registration and voting system in the United States; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board (GAB) is charged with implementing a Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS) that complies with HAVA; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Pulaski, a local unit of government, understands its obligations and commitments as mandated by HAVA and state statutes to implement and administer local voter registration; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government is required to maintain the local voter registration information within the centralized SVRS and the Village of Pulaski established an initial relier agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office to accept this responsibility for elections held since 2006; and

WHEREAS, the local unit of government has opted to renew its SVRS provider agreement with the Brown County Clerk's Office for elections held in 2012 and 2013; and

WHEREAS, the cost of administering a voter registration system is dependent upon the requirements of the system acquired by the State of Wisconsin, of which the costs estimated by

the Brown County Clerk to the local unit of government is based on the municipality's latest estimated census at a rate of \$.23 per person for each election.

THEREFORE, the Village of Pulaski directs the President to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Brown County to provide support staff for efficient and cost effective services that comply with HAVA and, where appropriate, incorporate the sharing of technology and resources.

FURTHER RESOLVE that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Government Accountability Board in recognition of the Village of Pulaski fulfilling its HAVA requirements.

Fiscal Impact: None

2012-2013 Agreement	2012 – Four Elections	2013 – Two Elections
Revenue- Chargeback	\$3255.88	\$1627.94
Expense-Clerk Typist I (LTE)	(\$3255.88)	(\$1627.94)

Fiscal Note - This resolution does not require an appropriation from the General Fund. Municipal revenues for elections have been included in the County Clerk's 2012 budget and will also be included in the 2013 budget.

Respectfully Submitted,

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approved By:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Authored by: County Clerk

Final Draft Approved by Corporation Counsel

**MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN BROWN COUNTY AND THE VILLAGE
OF PULASKI FOR THE STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM**

This Memorandum of Understanding is hereby entered into by and between Brown County and the Village of Pulaski.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the terms and conditions contained herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. The Village of Pulaski understands that the State intends to maintain the official centralized database of voter registration information.
2. The Village of Pulaski understands their responsibilities and requirements for complying with HAVA and state statutes and accepts the responsibility to implement voter registration policies and procedures and maintain each voter's current registration documentation.
3. The Village of Pulaski understands the technology, technology maintenance, staffing, and training costs that are required of Brown County to accept the responsibility of updating the SVRS. The estimated cost per election is provided and agreed upon by both parties.
4. Based on the above, the Village of Pulaski herein declares its intention to utilize staff, technology, and resources of Brown County and share in the responsibilities and costs associated with the administration of SVRS and this sharing agreement.
5. This agreement is valid from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2013. In addition, this agreement will be extended in 90 day increments unless officially terminated. This agreement can only be officially terminated if the following guidelines have been met:
 - a. Both parties to the agreement have notified the Government Accountability Board 90 days prior to the agreement being terminated.
 - b. The Village of Pulaski or new provider (municipality or county) assuming responsibility for updating the SVRS, has purchased the appropriate equipment and validated with the Government Accountability Board that they are capable of taking on the technology and resource responsibilities of the SVRS.
 - c. The Village of Pulaski or new provider (municipality or county) has validated with the Government Accountability Board that their clerks and appointed associates have been properly trained in the use and functions of the SVRS.

Ronald Kryger, Village President

Date

Darlene K. Marcelle, Brown County Clerk

Date

November 7, 2011

TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Ladies and Gentlemen:

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE USE OF FUNDS TO RETAIN OUTSIDE COUNSEL

WHEREAS, the Corporation Counsel has a duty to provide legal services and representation to the County; and

WHEREAS, the Port & Solid Waste Department is presently negotiating a "Solid Waste Management Services Agreement" with municipalities in Brown County; and

WHEREAS, the agreement being negotiated and potential related agreements to be negotiated in the future pose complex legal issues and potential risks to the County; and

WHEREAS, it is Corporation Counsel's opinion it is in the County's best interest to seek outside assistance.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Brown County Board of Supervisors authorizes Corporation Counsel to contract for outside legal services to assist the Port & Solid Waste Department with the agreements described above.

Respectfully submitted,

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Approved By:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Authored by: Corporation Counsel

Fiscal Note: This resolution does not require an appropriation from the General Fund. Funds are allocated in the Corporation Counsel budget for legal/professional services.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ROLL CALL # _____

Motion made by Supervisor _____

Seconded by Supervisor _____

SUPERVISOR NAMES	DIST. #	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN
TUMPACH	1			
DE WANE	2			
NICHOLSON	3			
THEISEN	4			
MILLER	5			
HAERFS	6			
ERICKSON	7			
BRUNETTE	8			
ZIMA	9			
EVANS	10			
VANDER LEESE	11			
BUCKLEY	12			
DANTINNE, JR	13			

SUPERVISOR NAMES	DIST. #	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN
LA VIOLETTE	14			
ANDREWS	15			
KASTER	16			
VAN VONDEREN	17			
SCHULLER	18			
FLECK	19			
CLANCY	20			
WETZEL	21			
MOYNIHAN	22			
SCRAY	23			
CARPENTER	24			
LUND	25			
FEWELL	26			

Total Votes Cast _____

Motion: Adopted _____ Defeated _____ Tabled _____

HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Brown County

305 E. WALNUT STREET
P.O. BOX 23600
GREEN BAY, WI 54305-3600



DEBBIE KLARKOWSKI, PHR

PHONE (920) 448-4071 FAX (920) 448-6277 WEB: www.co.brown.wi.us

HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGER

Date: November 4, 2011
To: Administration Committee Members
From: Debbie Klarkowski, Human Resources Manager
Re: Administration Committee Report

HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY REPORT FOR OCTOBER 2011

Hires:

Full-Time:

Certified Nursing Asst.	1
Correctional Officer	2
First Mechanic	1
Patrol Officer	1
Telecommunication Operator	2

Part-Time:

Library Clerk	2
Sr. Library Assistant	1

Limited Term/Seasonal/On-Call:

Certified Nursing Asst. – on call	3
Concessionaire I	3
Staff RN – on call	1

TOTAL HIRES: 17

Separations:

Full-Time:

Certified Nursing Asst.	1
Child Support Administrator	1
Licensed Practical Nurse	1
Patrol Officer	1
Social Worker/Case Manager	1

Part-Time:

Food Service Worker I	1
Library Clerk	2
Medical Transcriptionist	1
Shelter Care Worker	1

Limited Term/Seasonal/On-Call:

Intern – Planning Dept.	1
Nurse Practitioner – on call	1
Seasonal Asst. Park Ranger	3
Seasonal – UW Ext.	1
Summer Help – Parks	1

TOTAL SEPARATIONS: 17

Current Employees:

Regular Employees: 1406 (1322.72 FTE's)

Extra Help: 225 (Includes On-call, Seasonal, Summer, Co-op/Intern & Temporary Help positions.)

Total Employees: 1631

2011 BUDGET ADJUSTMENT LOG

NUMBER	DATE OF REQUEST	DEPT	DESCRIPTION	CAT	EXEC ACTION/ DATE	BOARD APRR REQ'D?	BOARD ACTION/DATE	FINANCE REF.
11-119	9/20/11	Human Services	Transfer of \$2,200 between accounts to cover bank service fees.	1	N/A	N		
11-120	9/12/11	Treasurer	Transfer of \$2,000 from interest account to bank service fees to account for the reduction in budgeted interest that was actually expenses.	5	Approved 9/20/11	Y		
11-121	9/15/11	Library	Transfer of \$3,000 from contracted services to cover bank service fees.	3a	Approved 9/20/11	N		
11-122	9/15/11	Library	Use of \$350 in Lester G. Wood Foundation fund balance for maintenance of the Wood Memorial Garden.	5	Approved 9/20/11	Y		
11-123	9/20/11	Information Services	Transfer of \$4,262 from the remaining fiber optics capital project funds to the Sheriff's facility project.	4	Approved 9/20/11	Y		
11-124	9/19/11	Child Support	Transfer of \$1,000 between accounts to cover unexpected toner/printing expenses.	1	N/A	N		
11-125	9/20/11	PALS and Information Services	Transfer of \$2,800 from PALS professional services to IS overtime to cover programming costs needed to update GIS data access systems.	4	Approved 9/20/11	Y		
11-126	9/20/11	Highway	Use of \$50,000 in reserved highway capital projects funds for culvert replacement on CTHNN road project.	4	Approved 9/20/11	Y		
11-127	9/20/11	Sheriff	Reclassification of \$20,840 OWI grant from state to federal revenue.	1	N/A	N		
11-128	9/20/11	Facility and Park Mgmt	Transfer of \$1,500 between Barkhausen accounts to cover County electrician costs.	3a	Approved 10/4/11	N		
11-129	9/22/11	Facility and Park Mgmt	Transfer of \$3,000 between Fairgrounds and Reforestation Camp non-outlay to purchase a replacement trailer for the Fairgrounds.	1	N/A	N		
11-130	10/4/11	NEW Zoo	Allocation of \$8,300 in restricted donations for the Zoo Boo.	5	Approved 10/4/11	Y		
11-131	10/3/11	Child Support	Use of \$5,636 in retained fund balance to cover maintenance agreement software prepaid at the end of 2010.	4	Approved 10/11/11	Y		
11-132	10/7/11	Facility and Park Mgmt/ Sheriff	Transfer of \$26,500 from the Jail to Facility Management to cover the Jail fencing project.	4	Approved 10/11/11	Y		

NUMBER	DATE OF REQUEST	DEPT	DESCRIPTION	CAT	EXEC ACTION/ DATE	BOARD APPL REQ'D?	BOARD ACTION/DATE	FINANCE REF.
11-133	10/11/11	Sheriff	Transfer between various funds to cover shortfalls in utility expenses.	3a	Approved 10/11/11	N		
11-134	10/11/11	Sheriff	Increase of \$22,000 in Jail phone commission for a new phone vender signing commission.	5	Approved 10/11/11	Y		
11-135	10/11/11	Administration	Transfer of funds to cover 3 rd quarter 2011 sick leave payouts for retirees.	3a	Approved 10/11/11	N		
11-136	10/14/11	Port and Solid Waste	Transfer of \$24,000 between funds to repair a transfer station compactor.	3a	Approved 10/19/11	N		
11-137	10/18/11	Port and Solid Waste	Allocation of increased tipping fee revenue and increased recycling rebates as well as transfer of various funds throughout the department.	5	Approved 10/19/11	Y		
11-138	10/17/11	Facility and Park Mgmt	Request to reallocate bond funds originally approved for courthouse renovations and upgrades to complete the video conferencing systems in the Courts.	2a	Approved 10/19/11	N		
11-139	10/18/11	PALS and Facility and Park Mgmt	Transfer of \$26,000 in energy project funds from PALS to FPM to purchase a pool cover for the Syble Hopp therapy pool.	5	Approved 10/19/11	Y		
11-140	10/18/11	Land and Water Con	Allocation of \$35,000 in state grant revenue for the pike project landowner payments to the Village of Suamico and Town of Pittsfield.	5	Approved 10/19/11	Y		
11-141	10/20/11	Museum	Allocation of \$50,000 from Neville Public Museum Foundation to support exhibit and educational program development.	5	Approved 10/23/11	Y		
11-142	10/18/11	Facility and Park Mgmt	Use of \$15,500 in Rails-to-Trails fund balance to cover unexpected expenses from culvert failures on the trail.	5	Approved 10/23/11	Y		
11-143	10/20/11	Facility and Park Mgmt	Transfer of \$3,000 between Boat Landing accounts to cover an overage in contracted services.	3a	Approved 10/23/11	N		
11-144	10/19/11	County Board	Allocation of \$750 in donations for Fair Veterans' Day events.	5	Approved 10/21/11	Y		
11-145	10/24/11	Child Support	Transfer of \$2,250 to interpreter services to cover increased cases referred by HS.	3a	Approved 11/1/11	N		
11-146	10/27/11	Facility and Park Mgmt	Transfer of \$4,000 between Fairground accounts to cover unanticipated building repair needs.	3a	Approved 11/1/11	N		
11-147	10/31/11	Circuit Courts	Request to use fund balance of \$10,000 to cover remaining 2011 mediation services.	3a	Approved 11/1/11	N		

NUMBER	DATE OF REQUEST	DEPT	DESCRIPTION	CAT	EXEC ACTION/ DATE	BOARD APPRL REQ'D?	BOARD ACTION/DATE	FINANCE REF.
11-148	10/27/11	NEW Zoo	Allocation of \$4,550 in credit card service fees to the proper account.	3a	Approved 11/11/11	N		
11-149	11/8/11	Administration	Allocation of additional fringe from Accounting to Purchasing to better reflect actual balances.	1	N/A	N		
11-150	11/10/11	Facility and Park Mgmt	Use of \$53,722 in fund balance to cover the cost of an ice making system at the arena.	5	Approved 11/11/11	Y		
11-151	11/10/11	Facility and Park Mgmt	Adjustment of revenue and expenses to maintain the old MHC building through the remainder of 2011.	5	Approved 11/11/11	Y		

BUDGET ADJUSTMENT REQUEST

<u>Adjustment</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Approval Level</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Category 1	Reallocation from one account to another <u>within</u> the major budget classifications.	Department Head
<input type="checkbox"/> Category 2		
<input type="checkbox"/> a.	Change in Outlay not requiring the reallocation of funds from another major budget classification.	County Executive
<input type="checkbox"/> b.	Change in any item within Outlay account which requires the reallocation of funds from any other major budget classification or the reallocation of Outlay funds to another major budget classification.	County Board
<input type="checkbox"/> Category 3		
<input type="checkbox"/> a.	Reallocation between budget classifications other than 2b or 3b adjustments.	County Executive
<input type="checkbox"/> b.	Reallocation of personnel services and fringe benefits to another major budget classification except contracted services, or reallocation to personnel services and fringe benefits from another major budget classification except contracted services.	County Board
<input type="checkbox"/> Category 4	Interdepartmental reallocation or adjustment (including reallocation from the County's General Fund)	County Board
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Category 5	Increase in expenses with offsetting increase in revenue	County Board

Increase	Decrease	Account #	Account Title	Amount
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	412.062.6181	Arena Renovation Architect	11,984
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	412.062.6182.100	Arena Renovation Construction General	41,738
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Use of Fund Balance	53,722
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			

Narrative Justification:

This budget adjustment is required to cover cost for the repair of the Arena Ice Making System which required replacing two Ammonia condensers, repair and/or replacement of two 100 HP Motors for the Air Handling System at the Resch Center, and transfer of funds from general construction to cover architecture expenditures. Funds will be transferred from the Fund Balance.

W E Dowell
Signature of Department Head

AUTHORIZATIONS

[Signature]
Signature of Executive
Date: 11/15/11

Department: FAM

Date: 11/10/11

BUDGET ADJUSTMENT REQUEST

<u>Adjustment</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Approval Level</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Category 1	Reallocation from one account to another <u>within</u> the major budget classifications.	Department Head
<input type="checkbox"/> Category 2	<input type="checkbox"/> a. Change in Outlay not requiring the reallocation of funds from another major budget classification. <input type="checkbox"/> b. Change in any item within Outlay account which requires the reallocation of funds from any other major budget classification or the reallocation of Outlay funds to another major budget classification.	County Executive County Board
<input type="checkbox"/> Category 3	<input type="checkbox"/> a. Reallocation between budget classifications other than 2b or 3b adjustments. <input type="checkbox"/> b. Reallocation of personnel services and fringe benefits to another major budget classification except contracted services, or reallocation to personnel services and fringe benefits from another major budget classification except contracted services.	County Executive County Board
<input type="checkbox"/> Category 4	Interdepartmental reallocation or adjustment (including reallocation from the County's General Fund)	County Board
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Category 5	Increase in expenses with offsetting increase in revenue	County Board

Increase	Decrease	Account #	Account Title	Amount
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.054.001.039.5307.100	Repairs & Maint – Equip	3,710
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100.054.001.039.5307.300	Repairs & Maint – Building	5,660
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.054.001.039.5501	Electric	5,100
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.054.001.039.5502	Gas	6,050
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.054.001.039.5503	Water & Sewer	5,800
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100.054.001.039.6190	Disposition of Fixed Assets	6,100
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.054.001.039.4900	Misc Revenue	8,900

Narrative Justification:

This request adjusts revenues and expenses to cover costs to maintain the old MHC building through the remainder of 2011. There is no levy impact from this adjustment.

AUTHORIZATIONS

WE Dewell
 Signature of Department Head
 Department: FPM
 Date: 11/10/11

[Signature]
 Signature of Executive
 Date: 11/11/11

BID TABULATION SHEET

PROJECT NAME: Security Fencing at Jail

SEALED BID: Project # 1469 for Facility & Park Mgmt.

BUYER: DCD

DUE DATE & TIME: October 12, 2011 at 11:00 am to BC Clerk

OPENING DATE & TIME: October 12, 2011 at 11:00 am in Room 200

CONTRACTOR	BASE BID	BID BOND	ADDENDUM 1	ADDENDUM 2	ADDENDUM 3
Patriot Fence	\$ 76,300.00	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Custom Fence	\$ 30,500.00	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fortress Fence	\$ 45,150.00	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
American Fence	Bid not read aloud at opening *See Note Below	No			
Northway Fence	\$ 71,030.00	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

*Note - Bid from American Fence was rejected due to not providing required bid bond. Bid has been returned.
